# The Nation

Vol. CIV NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1917 No. 2692

## The Week

A CONGRESS of Constructive Patriotism held its final session in Washington on Saturday. What is the ground upon which the advocates of universal military training and service—for that is what constructive patriotism at Washington last week resolved itself into—would erect their militarist structure? In other words, what is the international situation which they envisage, and what is the defence policy which America must pursue in response to that situation? The constructive militarists do not know. They make a point of not knowing. All other nations have built up armies and navies for something and against somebody. Here we are to arm for everything and against everybody. We must have land forces strong enough to repel invasion, and every nation is to be regarded as a potential invader. We are to have a navy second in rank in the Atlantic and first in the Pacific.

THE war in Europe is drawing to a close. At the worst it must end years before the defence programmes of the security leagues have produced results. And peace is fraught with all sorts of possibilities. It may bring the league of nations and disarmament or it may bring a system of super-alliances and super-armaments. But in either case we shall know where we stand. It will not do to argue that we cannot wait, that in a fortnight, as Rear-Admiral Peary declared on Saturday, the air fleets of at least four Powers, if not six, may be bombarding Washington. If the attack from the skies is to come in two weeks, or in two months, or even in a year, we are helpless in any case. If half a million Japanese troops can land in California in a month, we are lost even if we begin universally drilling this afternoon. Stress as they will the perils of the present hour, the preparedness leagues cannot explain away the fact that they are preparing for five and ten years from now. And it is with this knowledge in mind that people are asking themselves whether, in planning for defence long after the war, it would not be well to wait for the end of the war.

NEWS of the withdrawal of Gen. Pershing's army is highly gratifying. Two things, above all others, it has long been incumbent upon the United States to do: to bring back the troops and to send Ambassador Fletcher to his post, and both seem on the eve of accomplishment. So long as Gen. Pershing's forces remained on Mexican soil, they were best recruiting agents for Villa's bands, since he has used their hated presence as a means of drawing men to his standard on the plea that he would drive the Gringos out. Gen. Carranza was correspondingly embarrassed by their presence, just as it has seemed to him grossly unfair that he should have an envoy in Washington in Mr. Arredondo, while the United States refused to reciprocate by sending the Ambassador whose salary it was paying. The withdrawal of Pershing's army will have an excellent effect upon public opinion in Mexico, and, strangely enough, upon American investors in Mexico. We know of one company which has been waiting for Pershing's return before sending back its American employees. As for the expedition itself, Gen. Pershing is surely entitled to great credit for his handling of it. But that it returns without numerous bloody conflicts is a piece of luck for which we cannot be too thankful.

MR. WILSON'S daring phrase, "peace without victory," which is the expression that gives pain abroad, is not so unlike many things said by Liberal Englishmen. Take this, for instance:

> Some of my friends may think that the notion of a league of nations is Utopian and fantastic. It might be so if we were living in ordinary times, but we are not. We are standing upon the threshold of a new order of the world. . . . If Christian Europe does not now make up its mind to make an end to war, I do not see how civilization as we have known it is to go on. If you try to crush the Central Empires by a military decision, followed up by economic strangulation, you will carry forward into peace the hostilities and hatreds of war; you will make armies, navies, and armaments more oppressive than ever; you will make war more inevitable than ever, and you will fasten conscription irrevocably upon this nation and all others.

Who said this? Woodrow Wilson? Oh, no. Some infernal pacifist sitting comfortably at home while men are dying for England? Oh, no. It was a man in khaki, speaking in the House of Commons, after a year in the front trenches, Corporal Lees Smith, Member of Parliament. It seems as if Mr. Wilson must have read those words. Whether he did or not, in view of the fact that Corporal Smith spoke avowedly for many Englishmen in the trenches with whom he had been under fire, it is hardly surprising that the echoes from Europe seem to prove Mr. Wilson to have been right when he expressed the hope that he was speaking for the silent masses.

THE most important response thus far evoked by the President's speech to the Senate is that which came on Saturday from Petrograd, it being in no less weighty guise than that of a statement formally given out by the Russian Foreign Office. The statement is brief, and there is no qualification attached to its declaration that "we can gladly endorse President Wilson's communication." So far as the broad aims enunciated by Mr. Wilson are concerned, Russia is in the favorable position of having initiated the movement for international concert in behalf of peace by calling the first Hague Conference and of having urged at The Hague the policy of limitation of armaments. To these points accordingly, and to the President's advocacy of the principle of free access to the seas, which has historically been peculiarly a Russian contention so far as Russia herself is concerned, the statement from Petrograd calls particular attention. But, brief as the note is, it finds room also for reference to the two points in Mr. Wilson's speech which have been the subject of most criticism and controversy. His declaration concerning Poland is not verbally quoted, but Russia's "unalterable determination regarding the future of Poland" is declared to be the establishment of "a free Poland, which consists now

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of three separated provinces"—an amplification of Mr. Wilson's view which may not be as pleasing at Berlin or Vienna as it is at Petrograd. And as to "peace without victory," the phrase is made the occasion for stating that "it never has been the aim of the Allies to crush their enemies, and that they have never insisted upon victory in that sense over Germany." Take it all in all, the Russian note is a distinct contribution to that clarifying of the situation which has been going on in so remarkable a way since the issue of the President's note to the belligerent Powers.

NO features of the Revenue bill that has been adopted by the Democratic House caucus will be subjected to keener criticism than those which provide for new bond issues. And this is as it should be. Any increase of the national debt to provide for current expenditure in time of peace should be regarded as utterly out of the question. But those who wish to be not merely virtuous in intent, but just and accurate in their judgments, must be careful not to put into this forbidden category every borrowing. The distinction is clear in the case of the purchase money for the Danish West India Islands, and it applies also, though perhaps not quite so plainly, in the matter of the establishment of great industrial plants by the Government. This everybody sees, but apparently there is some disposition to overlook the distinction in the case of the issue of short-term Treasury notes, or certificates of indebtedness. It is true that this, too, may be illegitimate, and the matter should be closely scrutinized; but on the face of things, the authorization of such issue, beyond the limit hitherto permitted, is designed solely to bridge over an interval between the decreeing of new taxes and their collection. The law has long permitted $200,000,000 of such notes, so that it is only $100,000,000 that is added in the naming of $300,000,000 as the limit in the present bill. But to say this is by no means to belittle the importance of subjecting this whole aspect of the bill to the most searching examination.

THE way of Congress with riders to appropriation bills is often strange and wonderful; but it is much stranger and more wonderful to find it adding a rider to place Government officials under the civil service laws than to find it exempting them. Yet this was done on Friday when the Senate wrote into the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation bill a provision placing all Postmasters in the classified service. Some Senators properly declared that the provision was not apposite to the Appropriation bill, and there is an expectation that it will come out in conference with the House. But the action remains very promising. The Administration preceding Wilson's was willing to place all Postmasters under the civil service rules, and President Wilson's has by successive steps come to an emphatic pronouncement to that effect. Slowly sentiment in Congress appears to be moving towards agreement with the view of the President and Postmaster-General, and we hope that in some way or other the required measure will soon go through.

IN answer to the question, "Shall you pay especial attention to transactions in United States Steel?" Mr. Whipple, counsel to the House Rules Committee in the "leak" investigation, said to the New York newspaper men on Saturday:

> Naturally the Committee will give its attention especially to Steel. Perhaps you gentlemen know that 5,000,000 shares of Steel were traded in during the period under inquiry. The total capitalization of the United States Steel Corporation is something more than 5,000,000 shares. In other words, during those thirteen days [December 11-December 23] nearly the entire capital stock of United States Steel was turned over.

This is interesting, and may be important; but it is well to examine the matter a little before ascribing to it any extraordinary significance. The relation between the number of shares of a given stock dealt in and the total issue of that stock is slight and extremely variable; some stocks are habitually "turned over" in a very short time, others in a very long time. As for United States Steel, while the sales in those two weeks were extremely heavy, we must ask what relation they bore not to the total issue, but to previous records. Now, looking up the record for the last quarter of 1916, we find that in the fortnight October 9-October 21, the sales aggregated 2,563,000 shares, and in the fortnight November 20-December 2, 2,788,000 shares. Thus the five-million-share sale is not so extraordinary as might be supposed.

BUT an examination of the figure for the separate days of the fortnight December 11-December 23 throws further light on the question of whether the enormous aggregate of Steel shares sold is to be regarded as presumptive evidence of a "leak" as to the President's peace note. The number of shares sold on December 11 was 196,000, which is not at all extraordinary; but on December 12 there was a big break in stock prices, and the number of Steel shares sold jumped to 549,000. Was anybody astonished, or was there any reason to imagine some secret knowledge as the cause of it? Not at all; it was the day when *Germany's* peace note was issued, bringing an entirely new factor into the war-and-peace situation. The sales continued heavy for three days thereafter, the total for the four days being 2,220,000 shares—nearly half of the five million sold in the fortnight. The next two days' sales averaged less than 200,000; then there was again a big total—666,000 shares—on the day of Lloyd George's speech (though this ought not logically to have had any such effect) and the next day the sales were 394,000. We now come to December 21, which was the biggest day of all; 764,000 were sold that day, and 413,000 on December 22. But this tremendous total of nearly 1,200,000 shares in two days cannot be ascribed to the sought-for leak, since the President's note appeared in the morning papers of December 21, and so was known to all the world. It will thus be seen that, while analysis may show that the heavy sales of that fortnight were caused by operations guided by secret knowledge, the gross figures do not furnish much of a presumption to that effect.

SUPPOSE that, during our occupation of Cuba after the war with Spain, a writer, urging the United States to fulfil its promise to turn the government of the island over to its inhabitants, had confidently predicted that the Cuban people would prove equal to their task. And suppose that, in the enthusiasm of his advocacy, he had gone so far as to draw the following imaginary picture of what would hap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pen in the event of a hotly fought campaign for the Presidency, ending in an election whose result was disputed:

> Throughout the struggle, even at the most critical moments, the attitudes of President Menocal and Dr. Zayas have been characterized by dignity and moderation, both determined to defend their rights by every legal recourse, both deprecating most earnestly the least suggestion of disregard for the law, and both pledged to accept the final dictum of the Supreme Court, no matter what it might be.

Cannot everybody imagine the chorus of derision with which such a fancy picture would have been greeted in the year 1900? Yet here we have it, in the year 1917, not as an imagined possibility, but as a recorded fact. The ability of the Cubans to keep up the splendid sanitary régime introduced under the administration of Gen. Wood was the first great jar to preconceived notions about their hopeless unfitness to govern themselves; if they can successfully go through such a political test as that to which they have just been subjected, they will make it necessary for a good many persons to revise their views on the general subject of the capacity of outlandish peoples for self-government.

BETHMANN-HOLLWEG is accused indirectly of a sad lack of statesmanlike foresight by the *Vossische Zeitung* in its comments on British demands for reparation to Belgium. The only justification for such a demand, according to our German editor, is found in Bethmann-Hollweg's fatal admission at the beginning of the war that Belgium had been wronged and would be recompensed. "The German people," says the *Vossische Zeitung*, "has never assumed responsibility for these words, which, if the facts had been correctly known, would never have been uttered." What Bethmann-Hollweg should have foreseen was that the certain documents would be found in the Brussels archives which, by a little skilful manipulation, could be made to show that it was Belgium which was preparing to invade Germany. The only kind of reparation then conceivable would be, presumably, a large Belgian indemnity to Germany. After repudiating responsibility for Bethmann-Hollweg, the *Vossische Zeitung* might proceed to deny all responsibility for von Tirpitz and the submarine commander who sank the Lusitania and for von Bissing and the subordinate officials who are carrying on the Belgian deportations. The world might welcome this kind of justification if only the *Vossische Zeitung* would carry it out logically and repudiate in the name of the German people all responsibility for the man who gave orders to mobilize the German army in July, 1914.

THE handsome gift which Mr. James Stillman, a vice-president of the American Society for the Relief of French War Orphans, has just sent it as a personal contribution is an example of the kind of thing that must be far more general than it has thus far been if our country is to do that which its prosperity and abounding wealth make its clear duty. No doubt, other American men and women of great wealth have been unostentatiously generous, on a scale comparable with that of Mr. Stillman's gift of a million francs for the children of members of the Legion of Honor who have lost their lives in the service of France in the war; but the number of these is very small, while the number of those who could easily give sums of similar or even greater magnitude is by no means small. Among a large proportion of the hundreds of multi-millionaires and the thousands of millionaires of our country, there exists not only the ability, but a latent willingness, to exercise such liberal generosity. What is needed is to make these possessors of great means feel how magnificent a work of rescue is within their power collectively to achieve if each of them, or even if each of a considerable fraction of them, does his proper share. We trust that while Mr. Hoover is in this country an organized effort to accomplish this end may be set on foot—in the first instance for the sufferers in Belgium, and ultimately for a still wider range of service among the desolated peoples.

DISSOLUTION of the Japanese Diet, following upon Premier Terauchi's challenge of the principle of parliamentary responsibility, brings the question of constitutional government before the Japanese people in clear-cut form. There have been bitter struggles before this between the Government and Parliament, and they have usually been settled through the creation of a Government majority in Parliament, through the admission of Opposition leaders into the Cabinet, or through plain bribery. The formal assertion of the Executive's independence of Parliament is a new thing. How bitterly fought the new elections will be is already shown by the attempted assassination of one of the Opposition leaders, a fairly familiar method of political debate in Japan. It is hard to escape the impression that the present struggle has been precipitated, or at least intensified, by world-wide forces now working for the assertion of the constitutional principle under the impetus of the great war. In those belligerent countries where the parliamentary system is fully established, Cabinets have been swept out of power by the representatives of the people. Where the full parliamentary régime is not established, as in Russia and Germany, the Governments have been compelled to make concessions nevertheless, and, in the case of Germany, to hint at broader concessions after the war. Nowhere has the record of absolutism, as tested in the war, been so impressive as to make the people of Japan acquiesce in the Bismarckian principles laid down by Terauchi.

ONE aspect of the Parliamentary struggle in Japan may be recommended to the attention of the anxious patriots in this country who gaze eagle-eyed across the Pacific for the approach of the Yellow Peril. When Okuma made way in the Premiership for Terauchi, the appearance of that "strong man" was hailed as a menace to our own interests and security in the Far East. The advent of Terauchi meant that Japan had gone in openly for a policy of aggressive imperialism. Okuma's weak policy in China was supposed to have brought about his downfall. Behind his successor stood the Japanese nation as one man in favor of a policy which meant inevitable conflict with the United States. To-day we see that the Japanese nation is not as one man behind the Premier. But more than that, we see that the Japanese nation has other matters at heart than the throttling of China or the flouting of the United States. For the time being, at least, it is patently more concerned with the vindication of Parliamentary rights and with the furtherance of democratic institutions. Were Japan the armed camp which our anxious patriots are fond of describing, were the Japanese people obsessed by the sole idea of mastering China and humbling the United States, they would not now be turning upon this strong man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Exhaustion of Europe

AT first sight the estimate of 2,000,000 men for Germany's losses in the war, made by the *National Zeitung*, seems far below what the German casualty lists would indicate. Actually, the estimate agrees with the published figures. What the German writer has in mind is the final human wastage. Of a total of somewhat more than four million casualties recorded, one-fourth would be the dead. Of the wounded it has been stated for various countries that a very large proportion have been saved and rendered fit for duty; as high as 90 per cent. it has been said. This is undoubtedly exaggerated, and the *National Zeitung* admits as much when it deducts another million for the incapacitated and prisoners. It is an argument, however, that cuts both ways. If the drain on Germany's human resources has not been so heavy as the totals would indicate to the superficial observer, the same holds true for Germany's opponents. It means that England, for example, has suffered a wastage of not more than 600,000 men, that Russia's losses have not been so enormous as German calculators have made them out to be, that Italy's losses, measured by the present scale, have been little more than trifling. When the German editor points out that Germany has still some seven million men left out of the nine millions with which she began the war, he only emphasizes the great reservoir of men upon which the Entente Powers have still to draw.

Such figures reveal, what careful observers long ago recognized, the futility of demonstrating by exact arithmetic that this or that belligerent is on his last legs in the matter of fighting men. It has been a favorite game on both sides. There were Allied war experts who had no difficulty in showing early in 1916 that Germany was virtually down to her last man. One French writer of standing, by the most elaborate and impressive calculation, had the German reserve down to a paltry three divisions, or something like 50,000 men. But when the Austrians collapsed before Brussiloff's attack and lost nearly half a million troops, Germany somehow managed to scrape up the men to fill the gap in the Austrian line. Later she managed to bring up an army sufficient for the conquest of Rumania. The Germans themselves have sinned as badly. A year ago they had France bled white; that was before Verdun and the Somme. Nearly two years ago they proved in the most precise German fashion that Russia's human supplies were exhausted. Thereupon came the Russian conquest of Armenia and Brussiloff's advance upon Lemberg. How silly is all this business of measuring the outcome of the war by single divisions and brigades, just one basic consideration will show. It had been laid down as an axiom that no nation could bring into play more than 10 per cent. of her population for purposes of war. But France has called up one-sixth of her population. With an initial miscalculation of something like three million men in the case of France, of four or five millions, possibly, in the case of Germany, this balancing of men by driblets appears for what it is worth.

We may take it as a fact, therefore, that long before Europe is driven to peace by a shortage of men she will succumb to economic and moral exhaustion. Even here it is well to keep in mind the effort of which a nation is capable. The case of Turkey is an example. A French student of the war has estimated Turkey's army at fifty divisions, or somewhere between three-quarters of a million and a million men. How can bankrupt and economically prostrate Turkey manage it? The answer is supplied by the reports of tens of thousands of civilians who are perishing of starvation in Syria. You can keep up an army at a price. But it is also well to bear in mind that poverty and semi-starvation are endemic in the Ottoman Empire, and war conditions there involve no such sudden strain as the nations of Europe must face. A country with few industries does not suffer greatly from industrial collapse. A country with few railways is only disorganized a little more than usual by the breakdown of transportation. Where the peasant has been accustomed to pull his belt tight, he may be induced with comparative ease to pull it tighter.

In Europe, it is plain that in spite of all schemes for efficient organization, in spite of civic and industrial and agricultural mobilizations, the whole economic life of the nations is approaching exhaustion. The earth's fruitfulness is wearing out. The fact that this has been a bad crop year all over the world will not entirely account for the fear of famine. You cannot take away millions of laborers from the fields and starve the soil for its nutriment without undermining the food supply. The railways are wearing out. Train economies are practiced in Germany, France, England. The shifting of hundreds of thousands of men from front to front by which Germany has astonished the world imposes an enormous strain on trackage and rolling stock. Her food dictator has announced that the present food shortage is owing in large measure to difficulties of transportation. The grain from Rumania, which was supposed to relieve the food situation in the Empire—to an altogether exaggerated degree, by the way—has not been brought up, for lack of railway facilities, again according to von Batocki. Factory machinery must be wearing out under the strain of day and night work on munitions. Even German efficiency is wearing out. Regulation of food has been practiced in Germany for more than two years, and there is greater complaint than ever of mismanagement in distribution.

The nations may not be running short of men for the trenches, the military machines may still function efficiently, but the machinery of Europe's economic civilization is creaking and groaning under the lack of fuel, of lubricant, and of labor.

# Foreign Trade to the Fore

THE big gathering at Pittsburgh of delegates to the fourth National Trade Convention bears striking evidence of a degree of interest in questions relating to the systematic development of our foreign trade to which there was no approach in our country until within the last few years. The enormous expansion of our exports brought about by the great war is in itself sufficient explanation of the sudden accentuation of interest in all this class of questions; and the possibility of strange new policies being adopted by both of the great groups of warring nations in Europe makes still more acute, in the minds of those specially concerned with the subject, the problems involved.

It is notable that the subject of the protective tariff, at least in its traditional aspect, does not appear to have played much of a part in the proceedings of the Conven-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. In the first day's session, on Thursday, Mr. Willard Straight made a well-considered plea for a policy of what may be called tariff-preparedness; but it was of a very different type from the standard protectionist appeal for the rescue of the country from the peril of being ruined by the pauper labor of Europe. It is against dangers connected with the possible adoption by the European belligerent Powers of a policy of "economic war after the war" that Mr. Straight urges the need of a "bargaining tariff" —a tariff made flexible in such a way as to provide a defence for the foreign trade of the United States against attempted discrimination. The idea of a mere protectionist wall—a thing designed to keep out imports as though they were a plague—seems to have been quite outgrown among the kind of people who gather at such a Convention as that at Pittsburgh.

What was chiefly discussed was the organization of foreign trade and the mechanism by which it is promoted. As part of this mechanism the importance of adequate and suitable banking arrangements occupied a leading place, and it was suggested that the National Foreign Trade Council should appoint a committee to coöperate with a committee of the American Bankers' Association to study the question of American banking in foreign trade and make recommendations. Perhaps the most important point dealt with at the Convention was that covered by a report of the National Trade Council, which urged the immediate enactment (with some modifications) of the Webb bill, authorizing certain forms of coöperation among American exporters which, under the anti-Trust laws, might not be permissible in domestic trade. The argument in favor of such a measure was very effectively put in the report, and it seems clear that legislation of this nature, with proper safeguards, would be of great benefit to our foreign trade without impairing the maintenance of wholesome competition among American producers. Among the advantages expected from the contemplated forms of coöperation may be mentioned "maintenance of highly organized export services at minimum cost to participants," "more advantageous traffic contracts through greater and regular tonnage," and "survival of initial losses, fatal to an individual company, which are sometimes incurred before American goods gain a foothold." And it is because these and other forms of coöperation are available to our European competitors that their permission to American exporters is urged by the Council.

Altogether, the signs are abundant that the subject of the promotion of our foreign trade will not suffer for want of attention in the coming years. From the primitive stage in which, only a few years ago, it still remained it is rapidly advancing to a position of unquestioned prominence. Indeed, so swift are the changes we are in the habit of making when we once take hold of a matter with vigor that the danger is perhaps rather that we shall before long magnify the importance of the part that foreign trade plays in our national welfare than that we shall belittle it. We may easily, too, fall into the way of thinking that the shortcomings in our organization of foreign trade have been a handicap far more dreadful than has actually been the case. It is quite true that our trade with other nations might, if all had been done that could be done, have expanded more rapidly than it did, but we should not forget that long before the adventitious stimulus of the war was applied, its increase had been going on at an enormous rate. Our annual exports of domestic merchandise during the decade ending with the fiscal year 1894 averaged $800,000,000; in the next decade, the average was $1,210,000,000; while in the decade ending just before the war—the fiscal years 1905 to 1914—we exported domestic merchandise of the average amount of $1,920,000,000 a year—nearly 60 per cent. more than the average for the preceding decade, and 140 per cent. more than that shown in the decade before that. In the two fiscal years immediately preceding the war, our exports of domestic merchandise showed the enormous totals of $2,330,000,000 and $2,340,000,000 respectively, although the figure of $1,030,000,000 for the fiscal year 1897 was at that time—only sixteen years before—a record-breaker. These facts should be remembered, not as a reason for being indifferent to energetic and intelligent measures for the extension of our foreign trade, which of course deserve all encouragement, but as a reason for keeping our heads level on the matter.

Finally, it is not amiss to put in a word of warning about the question of "commercial supremacy"—a catchword which is sure to become very familiar in the near future. The more we expand our foreign trade, in all wholesome ways, the better; but our nation stands in no more need of commercial "supremacy" than it does of political "supremacy." The sporting instinct is gratified by the idea, and so far so good; but don't let us get possessed with the notion that the distancing of all other nations in the volume of our trade, or the squeezing of them out of every position into which we can by hook or by crook force ourselves, is essential either to our individual happiness or to our national pride.

## The President and the Railways

NOW that the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate has rejected, by a vote of 10 to 5, the proposals of President Wilson for the prevention of railway strikes, it behooves the nation to recall to mind the situation out of which those proposals sprang. During several midsummer weeks, in the midst of the Presidential campaign of last year, the country was absorbed in the contemplation of a threatened disturbance of its economic life so grave as to be classed in the minds of most people almost with the calamity of war itself. Whether the strike, if entered upon at that time, would actually have been so formidable, may well be doubted; whether it would have been entered upon if the unions had been met by firm resistance and had received no encouragement at Washington is also open to question. But of one thing there is no question at all—that a clash between the opposing forces, if it had taken place and had been maintained on both sides with any degree of obstinacy, would have inflicted upon the whole people of this country tremendous hardship and injury. How grave were the potentialities of such a situation had for many years been fully recognized by all who had given thought to the subject; but last summer the danger was for the first time brought home to the mind of the general public. And in the presence of that danger there was a universal feeling that, whatever might be the development of the immediate situation, measures must be taken to make the recurrence of such a situation impossible.

By no man was this conviction expressed with more un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compromising distinctness than by President Wilson. And he went further than to express his conviction that legislation to prevent such clashes should be enacted, or even his determination to insist upon such enactment. So clear did he regard the case, so manifest seemed to him the necessity of meeting it and the universal recognition of that necessity, that the action upon the eight-hour demand which in the first instance he recommended to the railway managers and which, upon their refusal, he urged upon Congress, was predicated on the assumption that the enactment of the supplementary anti-strike legislation was a practical certainty. Again and again he buttressed his refusal to insist upon arbitration of the issue at stake by the argument that, in yielding to imperious necessity of the moment, one was not weakening, but strengthening, the hold of the principle in the future. Thus, reviewing the history of the case in his address to Congress on August 28, he said that his course had been guided by what "is assuredly the best way of vindicating a principle—namely, having failed to make certain of its observance in the present, to make certain of its observance in the future."

The President found it impossible to put through Congress in the closing days of the session his programme of safety for the future. What the Brotherhoods demanded as the price of immediate peace, Congress gave. What the President asked for as the guarantee of future peace, it refused. During the campaign, Mr. Wilson pledged himself as strongly as possible to the accomplishment of the purpose when Congress should reassemble. It now seems probable that he will find it impossible to obtain the fulfilment of his object. In the form which he recommended, the project has apparently collapsed for the present; yet it would be premature to say that its prospects are utterly hopeless. What the Senate Committee has rejected it is not impossible that the House Committee may approve and the House itself be induced to adopt. Clearly, the President is under strong obligation to press upon Congress with all the energy at his command the adoption of a measure that can be counted upon to accomplish with reasonable completeness that safeguarding of the nation from the danger of economic paralysis through railway strikes to which, both before and after the passage of the Adamson act, he so deeply pledged himself.

Whether that object can be attained by means other than the legislation the President has recommended is, of course, a question that is entitled to full consideration. The essential element in that legislation is the provision not only that a railway-labor dispute must be submitted to investigation, but that during the pendency of the investigation neither a strike nor a lockout shall be permitted. In the substitute legislation now being considered by the Senate Committee, this vital feature is omitted. It appears to be the purpose to provide for compulsory investigation, but to put no prohibition on strikes while the investigation is going on. The moral effect of the final finding is doubtless expected to exercise an influence on the temper of the combatants; but, unless it is very clear in advance what that finding will be, the effect will come too late. The merits of a railway-labor controversy cannot be determined in a few days, nor generally in a few weeks; it is likely to be a question of months. And the terrible damage that was feared last summer would not have required months for its realization; a few weeks would have sufficed to inflict vast suffering and loss upon the country. This is doubtless realized by the Committee; for it is planning to supplement the provision for investigation by enacting special prohibitions on the physical obstruction of traffic. The stiffening of such prohibitions is undoubtedly desirable; but, while they would be helpful in the handling of a strike situation, it can hardly be thought that they would be adequate. Plenty of forms of intimidation may take the place of physical obstruction; and if the strike is in its nature of formidable strength, the possibility of paralyzing the country's traffic would remain very real, unless the provisions in contemplation are more sweeping than is at present indicated. What is needed is a law that will unmistakably give the country a feeling of genuine safety when any such situation arises as that which so agitated the nation last summer.

## Lord Bryce on Education

IT is not only in the United States that Latin and Greek are having to fight for their place in the sun. England, too, the very home and bulwark of the classics in education, has had to yield much to the movement to displace them—or, at least, to depose them from their old position. The Classical Association has for one of its aims to stand up for the educational faith once delivered to the saints; and its recent meeting at the University of Leeds was largely given up to a discussion of the question of retaining classical studies in modern education. The principal speaker was Lord Bryce. His address was a presentation of the case for Greek and Latin, all the more powerful for being moderate, open-eyed, and conciliatory.

He was no thick-and-thin opponent of the "modernizers." To them he was prepared to make many concessions. If they object to the "despotism of a purely grammatical study of the ancient languages," so did he. He declared it an untenable position, and frankly counselled the teachers of the classics to abandon it. Moreover, in the universities Lord Bryce would not compel all students to take classical courses. The "real problem," in his opinion, was to "find some method by which classical study, while dropped for those who would never make much of it, might be retained for that portion—perhaps from 20 to 30 per cent.—of the students who would draw sufficient mental stimulus and nourishment from it to make it a real factor in their intellectual growth." This is plainly the kind of sifting process which is being roughly worked out in American colleges.

In Lord Bryce's mind, however, such items are mere details. The main thing is to keep in mind the great objects of education. This he presses as urgently as any modernizer of them all. And he is ready to go part way with the innovators. With them he agrees that the ends to be aimed at in the school training of the young are the habit of close and accurate observation, the exact use of words, and the rousing of a thirst for knowledge. But once this thirst has been created, how is it to be satisfied? Partly by science, no doubt; but can literature and history be left out? Not if young men are to be taught both to know and to think. The only real educational problem, then, would be how to apportion time and effort between the two great departments of teaching, science and the humanities. But all the time, argued Lord Bryce, those responsible must be on their guard against confusing things that differ. "The conflict is not between letters and science, but between a large and philosophical conception of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aims of education, and that material, narrow, and even vulgar view which looks only to immediate practical results and confounds pecuniary with educational values."

Such calm and reasonable views carry unusual weight coming from one who is himself a convinced classicist. Lord Bryce's spirit and temper might profitably be imitated by our own educational controversialists. So far as the questions among them relate to facts, the utmost care should be taken to determine what the exact facts are. The opponents of Latin and Greek have made much of the actually small attainment derived from years of study. This is a sound argument, so far as it goes, but the question is fair, how much greater is the attainment in modern languages, or in science and history? Figures of the College Entrance Examination Board have been cited to show what low marks are won by students in Latin. But Prof. W. A. Robinson, of Lawrenceville School, points out in a letter to the New York *Sun* that the percentage of failures in Latin was about the same as in French or German or science, and "*very much lower* than that in English." Incidentally, Greek showed up better than any of the other studies. We are aware, of course, that the anti-classicists have an answer to this. Have they, however, an answer to the assertion that there are no short cuts and infallible recipes in education? Must we not face the fact that the greatest obstacles to a better system lie in the hard, and apparently necessary, physical limitations of our schools and, above all, in the nature of the raw material given to teachers to work with? So long as the idea uppermost in the minds of most boys who go to college—here in the East, at any rate—is to have a good time, make acquaintances socially valuable, and feed full on athletics, we doubt if any "system" which the wisest could devise would produce results much better than those we now have.

# Recent Aspects of Railway Regulation

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS relates in his autobiography how, returning from service in the Civil War, he cast about for something to do. "Surveying the whole field," he remarks, "I fixed on the railroad system as the most developing force and largest field of the day and determined to attach myself to it."

For three decades and a half railways had been visually in existence, yet so primitive was their character, so fragmentary and disconnected their service, that they had hardly found their allotted place in our industrial system when the war put an end to all new ventures. It fell to the lot of the Rebellion itself to expose the weaknesses of our transportation methods, to strengthen and adapt and make of our system an indispensable servant in the cause of the Union. So successfully was this pioneer work carried out of fitting railways to the exigencies of war that the principles we developed became the basis for European organization. We emerged from the conflict with our lines of communication not materially multiplied, but in far more efficient shape than when we entered it. And then the country called imperatively for railway facilities. The Pacific Coast must be linked to the Middle West, cost what it might, and the new farming lands now being invaded by an army of settlers must have the means of transporting their products to market. The railway was in truth "the most developing force of the day," and almost from that very moment it became a political and economic "problem." From a mileage of 53,000 in 1870, the railway system has grown until to-day it comprises over 250,000 miles of line. It has driven the western frontier into the sea and has forced its way into almost every nook and corner of this continent.

Bringing with its services to society the power to do enormous evil, it has created a "railway problem" which has been among the most insistent of the subjects under discussion in legislative chambers and among the people at large. Beginning with the Massachusetts Railroad Commission in 1869, of which Mr. Adams was the virtual creator, and of which he was for many years the chairman, the process of regulation has gone on in State and nation until to-day in only two States of our forty-eight is there no Commission exercising control over railways; and, what is of far more significance, we have a record of thirty years of service of a Federal Commission with powers which have been constantly extended, until its authority is greater to-day than any authority ever possessed before in this country by a public body over private industry.

So rapid has been the progress of regulation and so eager has each jurisdiction been to preserve to itself all the transportation advantages possible that the railway corporations have been forced into the embarrassing position of attempting to serve many masters. They have discovered to their sorrow that the Biblical prophecy is only too true; they have been compelled to hate the one and love the other, and, much to their disadvantage, they have held to the one and despised the other. They have found it impossible as they crossed State lines to reverse their practices with sufficient speed to satisfy the State which they were entering, and the penalties have fallen upon their heads. Regulations insisted upon by one State have often reduced the efficiency of service elsewhere just so far as they have accomplished their purpose in the State of their origin. It is this condition of regulation run riot that has occasioned the appointment of the Joint Commission of Congress, with Senator Newlands as chairman, to study from the bottom up the transportation system of the United States. After fifty years of development of facilities and methods of regulation, we purpose to take account of stock.

Congress has imposed upon this Commission a serious and comprehensive investigation. It must determine whether railways are being operated with efficiency, and if not why not; whether the difficulties that the railways profess to encounter in obtaining capital are merely of their imagination, or, if these obstacles are real, whether they are of the railways' creation, or whether they arise from conditions beyond the control of the carriers. It must determine whether the Interstate Commerce Commission is properly organized for the most efficient regulation of this giant industry, or whether its powers need modification or extension; whether the conflicts of Federal and State jurisdiction can be removed by any other method than exclusive Federal control of the agencies of commerce; whether there is any merit in Federal incorporation as a solution

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the many difficulties, or whether a resort to Government ownership is advisable. It is probable also that the Commission will be unable to adjourn without giving serious attention to the relations of the railways and their employees. No such important task has been imposed upon a Congressional Committee since the appointment of the Cullom Committee in 1885, upon the report of which was based the original Interstate Commerce act.

With the problems of transportation developing in such numbers and with such gravity, it is not surprising that Professor Johnson should have found it necessary to rewrite completely his standard text on American railway transportation.* His original book appeared in 1903 and was revised in 1908. The new volume gathers together in brief compass the latest phases of the railway situation and even includes statistical data from official sources as late as June, 1916. The omission from the original text of the topic of Government ownership was perhaps pardonable ten years ago in a book confined largely to the United States, but such an omission to-day would have subjected the author to the charge of being singularly insusceptible to the undercurrents of thought pulsating through this country. There is not only a considerable and increasing group of socialistically minded, who feel that nationalization of industry might well begin with the railways, but there are many among the railway owners themselves who realize that there must some time be an end to the attempt to accomplish such inconsistent results as high-grade service, high wages, and low rates, and who prefer to let the Government try the experiment. The policy of Government ownership, it cannot be too strenuously urged, is a matter of expediency, not of principle, and it should be looked to only as a last resort, if regulation fails.

Certainly it would be premature to say that regulation had to-day failed of its purpose. Yet its methods must be radically and speedily bettered if it is to commend itself as a permanent solution. It must be lifted out of the atmosphere of mere legal controversy between shipper and carrier over the matter of an individual rate, and set upon a higher plane. It will be the obligation of our regulating authorities not only to protect the public from the railways, but also to guard the railways from the public and from themselves. We are engaged in an experiment of profound significance to our entire national life—an attempt to control successfully a private industry with more than seventeen billions of capital. The experiment is not yet at an end. If it fails, Government ownership follows inevitably.

And the one supreme test of the success or failure of the experiment is *service*. Since the rate case in 1910, when Mr. Brandeis made his assertion that railway wastes were responsible for railway troubles, and that the carriers could save a million a day by the application of methods of economy, the question of the efficiency of railway operation has been a constant source of controversy—not without some gain, for agitation has had the effect of putting the less efficient railways under inquiry, and has led to the overhauling and more vigorous inspection of administrative methods, the elimination of wastes, and a greater watchfulness over expenditures.

The late James Peabody was a pioneer in the problems and statistics of cost accounting as applied to railways. The value of such accounting, long recognized as indispensable by the most modern of industrial plants, has worked its way more slowly into railway administration, and the influence of Mr. Peabody will long be felt and its value be more fully appreciated as time goes on, not only by the Santa Fé Railway, with which he was associated, but likewise by all railways of the country. It was Mr. Peabody's conviction that the larger the railway system, the more efficient and orderly the service, and that the small organizations leave much to be desired in the way of efficient administration.*

Mr. Peabody belonged to the group of men, relatively few in the railway field, but more numerous among the members of public regulating bodies, who believe in the "cost" theory of rate making—that is, in basing rates to a greater degree, if not wholly, upon the ascertained cost of the service rather than upon the value of the service or "what the traffic will bear." Most railway accounting officers dismiss this theory as impracticable because in an industry with so disproportionate an amount of overhead expense it is impossible to allocate expenses to individual shipments with sufficient accuracy to use them as a basis of rate making. Cost accounting is to them a series of arbitrary assumptions. The view which is growing in favor among regulating bodies is that while approximations will have to be employed in the case of many expenses, a far closer approach to a cost basis of rate making is possible than that to be found in the method now in force. Moreover, the accounting problems facing the railways are not unlike those that are met daily by any large industrial plant. Prof. Harry G. Brown, of the University of Missouri, is the most recent student of transportation rates to accept or at least strongly favor this cost theory.† His purpose is the ambitious one of presenting a complete theory of transportation rates and the principles that should condition their regulation. Surely, such a purpose is a laudable one. Concerned, as most of us are, with the immediate problem and its practical applications, we grow impatient and give little heed to the underlying considerations that in the end must determine how a proper rate structure shall be fashioned. It is an enormously complicated affair, bewildering to the uninitiated, and administered and modified by the railway traffic official according to rule-of-thumb methods, usually without much appreciation of the controlling principle. The official has grown up in the business, and he acts without the conscious guidance of any fundamental economic theories. The Interstate Commerce Commission has contributed much towards setting forth these principles and distinguishing between those which furnish a sound guide to conduct and those which are false or harmful. But one must read the mind of the Commission from its series of decisions. Hence there is constant need for some one to analyze these decisions searchingly for the revelation of general principles. It is no occasion for surprise, in view of the fact that the Commission is composed of mortal men, to discover many inconsistencies in their rulings as they have struggled towards a standard practice.

One problem of regulation, always difficult, has become more obstinate with the opening of the Panama Canal—

**Principles of Railroad Transportation.* By Emory R. Johnson and T. W. Van Metre. New York: D. Appleton & Co. $2.50 net.

**Railway Organization and Management.* By James Peabody. Chicago: La Salle Extension University.

†*Transportation Rates and Their Regulation.* By Harry G. Brown. New York: The Macmillan Co. $1.50 net.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the competition of transportation by water and by rail. The Commission has no authority over carriers purely by water unless they are owned by railways or operated as part of a joint route with railways. Congress, in order to make its purpose unequivocal, forbade any vessel owned by a railway to pass through the Panama Canal. The pure waters of that sacred stream were not to be polluted with the poison of railway influence. So it came about that the Commission must perforce permit the railways to grant lower rates to the Pacific Coast, where the influence of the Canal was felt, than those granted to mountain districts of the interior. And just as the plan was in full operation nature intervened with a slide in the Canal which put an end to Canal traffic for many months. Then came the European war with its demand for shipping, and now the profits of water carriers are so much greater in other lines of ocean commerce that they cannot be induced to use the Canal under any circumstances. The result is that the mountain cities, alert to their own interests, have prevailed upon the Commission to undo its labors and to suspend the low rates to the Coast granted to meet water competition, because there is no longer any water competition to meet.

Yet Professor Johnson, who because of his official association with the building of the Canal is eminently qualified to pass judgment on its economic value, is of the opinion* that with the restoration of peace and the return of commerce to its usual volume and to its customary routes, and with the decline of freight rates to a fairly normal level, the traffic of the Canal may be expected to overcome the setback and to increase with increase of international trade. However, to those who looked to the Canal to keep railway rates at rock bottom, and who did everything possible to prevent water carriers and railways from becoming too friendly, there can be little consolation in the prediction of this expert that in the course of time coastwise lines operating through the Canal may be expected to associate in "conferences" for the purpose of agreement upon uniform rates, and that they will tend to adjust the rates at a point which is just enough lower than the railway rates to obtain the tonnage requisite to fill the vessels in operation.

With the problem of better organization of our entire railway system staring us in the face and Government ownership looming on the horizon, we look with expectancy for any information concerning the English situation, where for many years the railways have enjoyed a manner of territorial monopoly and where Government operation of railways is now in progress. It is with something of a sense of disappointment, therefore, that we find the word "modern" to have a different connotation in England from what it has in these "up-to-date" United States. "Transportation in Modern England"† begins with the opening of the sixteenth century, and ends with the middle of the nineteenth, and in order to get a good start the story goes back to the Roman occupation of Britain. Mr. Jackman offers two explanations for the sudden termination of his historical labors, just as the problem is, for the student of present problems, beginning to arouse interest. He would not enter the field already covered on the economic side by such a writer as Acworth. On the historical side the railway systems in outline were complete by 1850, and we are too near the recent innovations of the automobile and the bicycle adequately to realize their influence upon road transportation. One might well pause before venturing in the field of railway economics to compete with so formidable an antagonist as Acworth, but the reasons assigned for failure to bring the history down into the twentieth century would hardly appeal, I fear, to a mere economist. Much history has been made in the field of railway operation and regulation since 1850, even in conservative England, and much more is now in the making, and one can only regret that the industry and scholarship displayed in this unusual sketch of economic history might not have been employed in bringing the development into direct touch with present-day problems. The more one studies the first two decades of railway history in England, the more one is impressed with the grasp that legislators of that day displayed of the real nature of the railway industry. No period of reckless overbuilding and destructive competition, such as disgraces our early history, is to be found. There the essentially monopolistic character of the industry was appreciated. Amalgamations and consolidations were encouraged, and the railway net developed in a much more orderly fashion. Had we possessed in this country a fraction of the insight of the English, we should have been spared much distress and many "problems."

FRANK HAIGH DIXON

*The Panama Canal and Commerce. By Emory R. Johnson. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

†The Development of Transportation in Modern England. By W. T. Jackman. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 2 vols. $7.25 net.

# Alsace-Lorraine—To-day and Yesterday

AN American correspondent who passes his whole time among those fighting for their homes and their lives cannot help finding it difficult to write for the American public. For he knows that voices now heard from America often "make the English mad and Frenchmen sad." However personal, human, intimate his acquaintance with men and facts may be, he has to expect that his judgment will be taken for one-sided—from the side which he sees—and it will also be taken for granted that his vision of men and things embraces but a corner of the reality at most.

> As what he sees is, so have his thoughts been.
> —Only the tract where he sails
> He wots of; only the thoughts,
> Raised by the objects he passes, are his.
> But what was before us we know not,
> And we know not what shall succeed.

Such criticism might turn even a thinker indifferent to his own good name from compromising it by expressing views on the volcano of Alsace-Lorraine. Puzzling voices from America distract his attention and his ears are assailed by the nearer and clearer German propaganda. Not a week, not a day passes without the question, burning ever higher, flaming before his eyes. So he must write of it, doing his best to give authentic news and not his own views, yet allowing himself to say "what he sees" in "the tract he wots of."

The latest news as I write—like facts are now of every day's news—is a resolution voted at Freiburg, the university town, by Germans of National Liberal, Centre, and Conservative political parties and printed in the Catholic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*Volkszeitung* or *People's Gazette* of Cologne. Much the same words are uttered in these days by German Socialists, appealing to workmen of the ante-bellum Internationale among allies and neutrals. Some Americans have taken up the refrain and joined with it the principle of the other and more official Cologne *Zeitung:* "For the same territory, Germany has 70,000,000 inhabitants, while France has only 40,000,000"; whence the conclusion follows as night the day—with our battle-axe we are doing nothing but hack out our place in the sun. So the Freiburg resolution says: "The annexation of Briey and Longwy [the great iron-mine region which still remained to France after the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine by Germany] is indispensable to the security of Germany." And then, as a final rider: "On the ground of this war's experience and in the interest of the German Fatherland whole and entire, and particularly to make sure of protection for South Germany, we demand the development to westward of the unfavorable frontier of the Vosges." This would further annex the grave of French Jules Ferry, who, dying, asked that he might be buried facing "the blue line of the Vosges Mountains," beyond which his homeland was held captive. Thus German Socialists, who pretend the least, say: "There can never be any question of restoring Alsace-Lorraine to France (and to her own native inhabitants)"—and these Moderates of Freiburg add: "To keep Alsace-Lorraine, which we hold by force of conquest, we must now further take by force another strip of France"—likewise without consulting its inhabitants and notoriously against their hearts and wills.

I do not think it is a "view" to translate such "news": The German millions (they were not 70,000,000 in 1871, when 2,000,000 native inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine with their native land were annexed by force of German armies) have the right to take their neighbors' fields and mines and towns for their own expansion—"to have their place in the sun." Socialist voices that reach us from America echo this, saying in propaganda manner: "Peace must not re-annex Alsace-Lorraine to France."

On Twelfth-day after Christmas—Epiphany Day, when Christ, King of the Jews, was manifested to the Gentiles and when, though the day's meaning may have been obscured, Christmas vacations in France still have their traditional end—thirty blue-uniformed, white-collared young marines, from twelve to fifteen years old, stood in ranks at attention in a reception room of the French Naval Office before Admiral Lacaze, Minister. They were on their way back from Thann, their native town in the strip of Alsace which the French army has "re-annexed," to the port of Lorient, where they are learning to be engineers of the French navy. The Admiral made a little speech of welcome, excusing himself for lacking time to put on his grand uniform. The head boy-marine made a little speech of thanks, and then all cried together—*Vive la France!* Earlier in the morning, ladies of the Aid Committee for Orphans of Alsace-Lorraine led groups of exiles and refugees to put wreaths at the foot of the statue of Strasburg, which, with seven other cities of France, represents their still captive land in the Place de la Concorde of Paris.

Conquest and exile and this winning back of the land, morsel by morsel—and the belated counter-protests against "re-annexation"—cannot but bring to mind prophetic utterances of Emperor Francis Joseph, who was already full of tragic experience then and is now dead while the tragedy is working up to its irrepressible crisis. To William of Prussia, King and newly Kaiser, he said: "I congratulate you on the annexation of an open sore to your empire." The annexation, as all may plainly see now, meant worse than that. It made manifest a world once more accepting the exercise of the right of conquest. It relegated to the paper heap the right which the American Revolution affirmed and by which consent of the governed people must have something to do with just powers of government.

My own memories of the people of Alsace and Lorraine go back to the last days when they were citizens of France—

> sons born free,
> Who stand in her sight and in thine, O sun,
> Slaves of no man, subject of none—

equal with other Frenchmen and exercising more than their mere numbers would warrant of the public life of France. Forty-six years they have been held by force as subjects of a Reichsland, without the consent of their wills being once asked. Their last act as a community of two million souls was to fight with their bodies against the constitution of such a *Reich*—the new conquering and annexing German Empire.

Since this war has been turning to the confusion of Germany, particularly in these last weeks, German Socialists have been trying to persuade one-time Internationalists, at Kienthal and Zimmerwald and The Hague, by secret emissaries and in public prints and through neutrals, that—in the name of their peculiar principle—the coming peace treaty must not "annex" Alsace-Lorraine to France; and Americans are warned that their own principles require at least a *plébiscite*—a vote of those now living in Alsace-Lorraine under German bayonets. There was no *plébiscite* in 1871, and the protest of the delegates of the people of Alsace-Lorraine was unheeded by America when Germany forced the Treaty of Frankfort on France and annexed their country. It was then, on the 1st of March, 1871, that their representatives elected by vote expressed "the unanimous will of the populations of Alsace and Lorraine: We declare once more null and non-existent the pact which disposes of us without our consent. It remains open to all and each to take back our rights in the form and measure which our conscience shall dictate." None that knows can doubt what the conscience of Alsace and Lorraine dictates to-day.

My personal memories have to do with the native people of Alsace and Lorraine then and since then and now, and with their utter refusal of consent to being governed by Germans, and with what a genuine *plébiscite* of the real people would surely give. First, there were the discouraged few whom I heard singing interminably their songs of blue Alsatian mountains in the steerage of ships bearing them and their uprooted hopes to America. One I afterwards met, returning prosperous to take back a wife to the New World, where he had done well "in the meat business." He did not forgive those who prevented his taking his wife to the native village for which he was ever homesick.

Next, as years passed, I have met everywhere in France some of the 350,000 Alsatians and men of Lorraine—the *exilés* of Paul Acker, who was one of them and described their lives and feelings and died in this war, trying to recover the old home. These have continued to hold honored positions in France as they always had done—in church and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state, in university and army, in business and politics. In their native land, ruled by Germans, no place of public administration or responsibility was open to them and their very judges were alien masters. Not even were they capable to teach their own young their new masters' goose-step, for they might have mixed with it some march of Alsatian freedom. Their mining lands have been taken by the all-confiscating empire; and the Imperial masters have gathered to themselves the business possibilities of their country. Surely, these should have native rights, man to man, against the pretended "acquired rights" of the 350,000 immigrants from Germany who are to swing the *plébiscite* if they can get it.

I have had unequivocal and competent testimony of the disposition of the million and three-quarters of the native population of Alsace and Lorraine, including the new generation which German masters have had every opportunity to mould—and have failed. I sat, some years before the war, for a long afternoon with a North German official, while formalities of customs were going on. He had been one of the early administrators of the recalcitrant land and was perhaps of the older German generation, before Prussia imposed the Junker spirit on all the Empire's subjects. He had even married a native woman and passed his life with the Alsatian people. In after-dinner confidence, he declared his firm conviction: "We have been absolute masters here forty years and we are further from reconciling the natives to our rule than ever. I do not believe it will ever be done until all natives of Alsace and Lorraine are driven out and the country is settled anew with bona-fide Germans." Since this war, reckless German writers have said the same thing—and advised the operation.

Then he added, for he was not an evil man and liked to show that he could speak French: "I wish this people could have their own country and be a buffer between us and France." Shortly after came the brutal treatment of natives by Prussian army officers like the ill-famed young Baron von Foerstner at Zabern (which born Alsatians, with all their accent, affect to call by the French name Saverne). Now, during war, each week brings news of more families of Alsace and Lorraine being swept away into concentration camps, quite as if they were French—for conquering Militarism does not stick at contradictions.

STODDARD DEWEY

*Paris, January 15*

# The Vote on Measures in the Election of 1916

POPULAR expression of opinion upon constitutional and legislative proposals last November showed a marked recovery from the electoral debauch of 1914. In that year, 286 measures were considered. At the election of 1916, the number fell to 111. The reduction is not to be explained merely by the difference in the number of States participating in this activity, the 31 of 1914 having shrunk to 23 two years later. For the worst offenders of the former election reappeared in 1916, but how chastened! California, which in 1914 had indulged in an orgy of 48 proposals, was content last November with a paltry 7. Oregon dropped from 29 to 11, Arizona from 19 to 12, Colorado from 16 to 8, and Minnesota from 11 to 8. Only one State which voted upon any considerable number of proposals moved in the other direction, South Dakota passing upon 14, an increase of 2. Washington stood pat with 10. Louisiana, which voted upon 17 constitutional amendments in 1914; Missouri, which voted upon 15 amendments and statutes, and North Carolina and Wisconsin, with 10 amendments each, were absent from the ranks in 1916. In both elections, the amendments voted on outnumbered the statutory proposals. The discrepancy was especially great in 1914, when the figures were 202 and 84; last November, 64 amendments were placed before the voters, and 47 bills.

But the voters were not to be thrown off their balance by these differences in the number of measures with which they were confronted. In 1916, they adopted 9 which might be classed as political and rejected 36, adopted 21 which might be termed economic and rejected 13, and adopted 15 which might be characterized as social and rejected 17. The total adoptions were 45 and the total rejections 66, a percentage of rejection of 59. In 1914, the percentage of rejected measures was 58. The conclusion seems plain that, regardless of the number or kind of the proposals submitted, the American voter deems it the part of wisdom to reject three for every two he accepts. This principle would be sufficiently creditable to his powers of discrimination if it were applied with mathematical exactness in every State, but it is the ability to vary from it upon occasion which constitutes the final proof of his acuteness. Two years ago, Georgia adopted every one of the 9 amendments on her ballot, and South Carolina was equally hospitable to 10. North Carolina and Wisconsin, on the other hand, rejected 10 amendments each, and Missouri set a new mark by voting down an entire lot of 15 bills and amendments. These records were not touched in November, 1916, the nearest approach to them being made by North Dakota and Rhode Island, each of which adopted a batch of 4 proposals, and Washington, which rejected an offering of 10. Idaho carries whole-heartedness suspiciously far; having rejected three amendments in 1914, she accepted two, all that were proposed, in 1916. Oklahoma, Wyoming, Minnesota, and Washington, all made a brave effort at wholesale acceptation in 1914, and Minnesota again in 1916, but in every instance one or more proposals ran into the teeth of the provision operating in these States, by which a majority of the vote cast at the election is required and not merely a majority of the vote polled upon the proposal.

The most radical measure voted upon in November, 1916, was one to abolish the Senate of Arizona. It was defeated by two to one, the ratio in which Oregon divided upon the same proposal in 1914. Oklahoma is thus still alone in the distinction of leaning towards a one-chamber Legislature, even if her majority in 1914 of more than 20,000 for a unicameral body of 80 members was among those rendered futile by failure to receive a majority of the entire vote cast at the election. Next to the Arizona proposal may be placed one in Arkansas to prohibit the amendment of "initiated" laws except by popular vote, to require a unanimous decision of the State Supreme Court to invalidate a measure adopted by popular vote, and to prevent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

court appeals to keep measures off the ballot. This proposal was rejected by a vote of 74,000 to 69,000. Whether either of these measures is more radical than the proposal for a general eight-hour day, defeated two years ago in California and Washington; or than the amendment making judges in Mississippi elective, which was adopted; or than the one making newspapers in Colorado public utilities, which somehow failed, one may judge for oneself.

What is not doubtful is not merely a disconcertingly conservative attitude towards political proposals, in States in which discussion of political principles and political machinery is supposed to take precedence of everything else, but a lack of keen interest in such measures. The proposal to abolish the Senate in Oregon, in number of votes received, both for and against, stood thirteenth in the list of 29 measures voted upon at that election. The corresponding proposal in Oklahoma was last in a list of four. In Arizona, in November, 1916, it came ninth in a list of 12, and the Arkansas proposal was only saved from being the last of five by another proposal dealing with election machinery! Nineteen hundred and sixteen seems to have produced no formidable rival for curiosity to South Carolina's proposal of 1914 to empower the town of Fort Mill to assess abutting property for permanent improvements—this proposal being not a statute, but an amendment to the State Constitution; or to North Dakota's proposal to amend her Constitution by making a sweeping change in the name of her asylum for the blind, or to the proposal in South Dakota to fix the course of study at Aberdeen Normal School by statute.

Woman suffrage failed of adoption in November in every one of the four States which voted upon it, these being Iowa, New Jersey, South Dakota, and West Virginia. One State, Massachusetts, voted to hold a Constitutional Convention, and three, Colorado, New York, and South Dakota, voted not to hold one. Maryland set an example for the rest of the country by adopting a budget system. Under it, the Governor must submit to the Legislature, within twenty days after it convenes, two budgets, one for each of the ensuing fiscal years (the Legislature meets only every other year at Annapolis), containing a complete schedule of estimated revenues and proposed expenditures. In addition, the Governor must present a statement of the revenues and expenditures for each of the two preceding years, together with an exhibit of the State's financial condition. He may amend or supplement this budget before final action is taken, and the Legislature may increase or decrease items relating to itself or increase items relating to the judiciary. Neither house may consider other appropriations until the budget bill has been finally acted upon by both of them. Oregon added herself to the list of States which allow the Governor to veto items in appropriation bills. It is not generally realized that as many as 37 of the 48 States have this provision; still less that all but 9 of them had it as long ago as 1898. By a narrow margin, Oregon voted to retain in her Constitution an anachronistic prohibition of negro and Chinese suffrage, and by a wide margin Colorado voted down a civil service law.

The most peculiar phenomenon in the voting upon what may be termed political proposals occurred in Arizona, where, as *Equity* sees it, the people "narrowly escaped a bad fall." One of the amendments submitted altered the existing arrangements of the initiative and referendum by providing that any measure submitted under either of them, in order to become a law, would have to be approved "by a majority of the total vote cast at election." Strangely enough, this treacherous measure, although it attracted more votes than some other proposals drew out, was defeated by only 600 votes! Would it not be well for friends of the I. and R. to bestir themselves and circulate petitions for putting on the ballot in every State enjoying the blessing of these twin guardians of our liberties a proposal that any proposal to require a majority of the total vote cast, instead of the vote cast on a measure, shall require for its adoption a majority of the total vote cast? Among economic questions voted upon in November, the single tax was the most important. Two Western States defeated it—Oregon, which has rejected it in one form or another upon several occasions, voting against it almost four to one, and California, which two years ago rejected it in the form of "local taxation exemption" by 100,000, confirming this decision by a majority of more than two to one. Arizona rejected a workmen's compensation proposal, and New Jersey one relating to excess condemnation. Oregon and South Dakota voted for a system of rural credits, and the latter against guaranteeing bank deposits.

Prohibition looms largest among what we may loosely call social measures. One who knew nothing of the interest in this question except what the figures told him would have an accurate idea of its place in contemporary attention. Two years ago, it called out more votes in Washington than the contest for United States Senator, and both then and in 1916, wherever it was voted upon, it overshadowed all other issues. Last November, no other measure in California came within 135,000 votes of those cast upon it; it led in Michigan by 60,000; in Maryland, it received 68 per cent. of the total vote for President, and in Nebraska 87 per cent., the only other proposal in these States to divide consideration with it receiving but 44 per cent. and 65 per cent., respectively, of the vote for President. California and Maryland decisively rejected it, although the former reduced her 170,000 majority of 1914 against it to 100,000. Idaho, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, and South Dakota adopted it, while Oregon strengthened her provisions regarding it. Of almost equal significance was the vote upon the question in States which already had it. Arkansas and Arizona rejected local option; Arizona prohibited the importation of liquor; Colorado refused to allow the manufacture and sale of beer; Oregon took the same stand regarding malt liquors, and Washington rejected two proposals designed to weaken her prohibition law. California, on the opposite side, displayed the same consistency by rejecting a proposal to prohibit the sale of liquor in any public house and to restrict its transportation.

What light do these votes throw upon the alleged relation between woman suffrage and prohibition? In 1914, three of the woman suffrage States went dry and one went wet. Last November, two States in which women vote, Idaho and Montana, adopted prohibition, and one, California, rejected it. Similarly, two States in which women do not vote, Michigan and Nebraska, adopted it, and one, Maryland, rejected it. Idaho gave the largest proportionate majority for it; Michigan the largest absolute majority. Maryland gave the larger proportionate majority against it; California the larger absolute majority. And South Dakota's contribution to the discussion

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was adoption of prohibition by a majority of 12,000 and rejection of woman suffrage by a majority of 5,000. Of the other three States which rejected woman suffrage, two, Iowa and West Virginia, have prohibition; one, New Jersey, does not. Another question in which voting women might be thought to be particularly interested is the abolition of capital punishment. Arizona's women participated in the election of 1914, when the death penalty was retained by 1,252 votes, and in the election of 1916, when it was abolished by 152 votes. Oregon had a difficult time in deciding not to abolish compulsory vaccination, 99,745 men and women voting to abolish and 100,473 voting not to abolish.

Two years ago, the result of the voting upon proposals submitted to the people was characterized as showing that the voters were in a "reactionary" mood. This is a matter upon which an individual may well hesitate to pronounce with dogmatic finality. The impression which one observer has gained from a general survey of the voting in November is that, if the people are not so superior to their chosen representatives as they are often assured that they are, neither do they deserve a scolding. Like other sovereigns, they do not always choose the path pointed out to them with aggressive confidence by philosophers.

ROYAL J. DAVIS

# Correspondence

## THE PRESIDENT'S IDEALISM

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The seeds of human progress will germinate only in a soil fertilized with a good mixture of idealism, but the good substantial soil must be there, too, as well as the idealistic fertilizer. In his two important outgivings since his reëlection, I cannot avoid the feeling that President Wilson has doomed his idealistic efforts to failure, except in some remote future, by breaking their connection with the earth on which we are now living. I am decidedly of the opinion that there was more real promise for the future, an idealism much more likely to produce definite results for the blessing of mankind, in the President's two Lusitania notes than in the peace note to the belligerent Powers and the recent address to the Senate. The measured precision with which those notes classified the sinking of the Lusitania as a wanton violation of international law and an outrage against the dictates of humanity gave seeming promise that from that time on international law and humanity would find active neutral championship, with our own Government in the lead. The firm attitude of Washington in this matter led to pledges from Germany which were heralded at the time as a great triumph of American diplomacy.

But things have changed since then. The President is devoting his attention to such matters as the peace note and the address to the Senate, and the people have no indication that any real pressure is being applied either to obtain such poor satisfaction as is possible for the murders of the Lusitania or to call Germany to account for her direct violation of the pledges given against the repetition of such outrages. The crowning outrage of the enslavement and deportation of Belgians comes on, and draws from Washington a "protest" as notably mild as the Lusitania notes were strong. And our Ambassador at Berlin is allowed to get up at a banquet, attended by many high German officials, and make an effusive speech on the exceptionally cordial relations now existing between this country and Germany. One can hardly believe that these things have no connection with the President's recent utterances. Lifted up on the wings of his present idealistic purpose, he has apparently concluded that this is no time to call a spade a spade, as he did in the Lusitania notes. But a spade is a spade, after all, and the world is not going to get out of the present mire by any blurring of moral distinctions. A ruthless imperialism at Berlin plunged the world into the most terrible war of history, for ends which it was not willing openly to state, but ends of which the outside world was fairly well aware at the time and considered wholly unjustifiable. The one thing that can work most effectively to prevent the repetition of such an offence in the future is its utter failure in the present case. And incidentally, its utter failure will almost inevitably mean the passing from the stage of the form and the personnel of the Government which made it possible. Such an issue could in no right sense of the term be called a peace without a victory, but for the peace of the future it would give a hundredfold better security than any peace which would leave the Hohenzollern dynasty a plausible plea for continuance in the power which it has so tragically misused.

W. H. JOHNSON

*Granville, O., January 27*

## THE PRESIDENT'S PEACE NOTE

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am heartily in sympathy with the conclusions of your Princeton correspondent of December 24, F. J. Mather, jr., and look upon the President's peace note as unwise. Talk of peace now is much like the action of the Democrats in 1864 behind McClellan, on a platform, "the war a failure to restore the Union." As you suggest, Germany would have peace, but largely on her own terms. Horrible as may be the prospect, I do not look for any permanent peace until, like our Southern Confederacy, Germany is thoroughly exhausted and beaten. It is the price this century must pay for the permanent overthrow of tyranny and for advancement of permanent liberty. The European events run parallel to our own Civil War, Verdun, like Gettysburg, being the turning point, and the advancement of Lloyd George being comparable to that of Grant to the position of lieutenant-general. The campaign of 1917 for England and France I take to be like that of Grant in '64 in the wilderness.

Only by exhaustion and defeat can Germany be saved to herself, like the new South after the surrender of Lee.

H. J. MARTIN

*Vermontville, Mich., January 6*

## DEMOCRATIC CONTROL OF THE WAR-MAKING POWER

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The problems that must be considered in connection with the terms of peace which shall end the war now devastating Europe display a complexity that is truly bewildering. It would seem, however, that as the discussion of these problems proceeds one question will certainly become more and more prominent, and will finally be found

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be so fundamental that its determination will appear necessary before any advance can be made towards a settlement of the conflicting claims of the belligerents. This question relates to the reliance the Allies can place upon the fulfilment of any agreement made by Germany who has so lately dealt with her treaties as mere "scraps of paper." How can the Allies gain the guarantees they must necessarily demand that the new treaties to be signed will not be treated in the same manner in future? This is a problem that must be solved before any treaty of any value whatever can be executed.

Such guarantees might perhaps be gained as the result of a continuance of the war until the power of Germany were utterly destroyed; but it now seems probable that such a result could be reached only after a struggle that would be ruinous to all the countries involved. Short of such utter destruction, they might be gained, perhaps, by the removal of the Hohenzollern dynasty, and the substitution, in place of its rule, of a new government of a more truly democratic type, with similar changes in Austria. But evidently any demand by the Allies which looked to such radical changes in the governmental forms of the Central Powers would be promptly rejected, not only by the existing autocracies, but, in my judgment, by the Germans and Austrians as a whole. The Austrian people show few signs of discontent with the rule of their autocracy, and the German people appear to have learned to worship the governmental system under which they have made such marked material progress during the last half century. No such change could be forced upon them until they were crushed.

The question then remains: Is there any demand that the Allies could make in the near future that would practically satisfy their need of treaty guarantees, and which at the same time might be acceptable to the Central Powers in the critical stage in which they now find themselves? Is it not possible that an adequate protection to the Allies might be obtained if they agreed to accept the written word of Germany and Austria-Hungary only on the condition that the Constitutions of both states be so changed that the power to make war be taken from the autocratic rulers, the assent of the several parliamentary bodies to a declaration of war being made necessary, as is now the case in the United States? And is it not possible that the Central Powers might yield to such a demand?

Turning first to the latter question—the acceptance by the Central Powers of this suggested demand of the Allies would certainly involve a great concession on the part of the former; but the Liberal parties within the Central Empires would probably welcome a proposal which would lead to a considerable increase of their powers, and they might well have strength enough to compel the acquiescence of their rulers. Such a concession would be the more likely to be made for the reason that the Allies, in making the demand, would themselves be compelled to offer to make a similar change in their own governmental procedure. England and France seem ready for the change; Italy would not be slow to follow their lead; and Russia could surely be induced to agree to accept the condition, which, under diplomatic pressure, might also be forced upon Japan and the less powerful states.

Turning now to the question as to the adequacy of the guarantees the Allies would obtain by Germany's acceptance of such a proposal, it is to be noted that no claim could be made that such a change of governmental procedure would in itself render impossible the recurrence of a war similar to the one we are now witnessing. We all realize that even the United States might be so involved with foreign Powers by the acts of a jingo President that Congress would be practically forced to make war. But we realize also that the fact that Congress must say the final word must on the whole act as a very effective check upon any such acts by the Chief Executive.

Assuming the autocratic powers of the rulers of the Central Empires to remain in other respects what they now are, does it not seem highly improbable that the present war could have been precipitated as it was, had the Austrian Government known that it must gain the consent of the representatives of the people before it could attack Servia, or had the German Government known that it must have the approval of the Reichstag before it could make war upon Russia? Is it not likely that the Austro-Hungarian Parliaments would have insisted upon a conference with Russia before action was taken against Servia, after their unprecedented ultimatum had been served upon her? Indeed, is it likely that such an ultimatum would ever have been delivered in the form in which it was given had the executive felt that a final sanction of the action must be had from the representatives of the people? Is it not likely that Germany, at the start, would have met the first mobilization of the Russian forces with no more than a counter-mobilization, had the power to declare war rested in the Reichstag rather than in the hands of the Emperor? And is it not likely that, if Germany's declaration of war had been delayed, the efforts of the Allied Powers and of neutral states might have served to avoid the present great catastrophe? Is it likely that the Reichstag could have been persuaded to assent to Germany's unprovoked attack upon Belgium?

The suggestion I am here making is not presented as a certain preventive of wars. In all mundane matters we must be content if we can make some advance, however small. And surely such a change of governmental procedure as is here proposed, if adopted by all the powerful nations, as it has already been adopted by the United States, would be a great step forward on the road towards enduring peace. HENRY RUTGERS MARSHALL

*New York, January 12*

## "CURBING OUR SPECULATORS ABROAD"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To the *Nation* of January 4 Mr. Richard Dana Skinner contributes an article in which he suggests the possible use of the Federal Trade Commission for curbing our speculators abroad. In that connection it would be well to ponder over the opinion of the United States Supreme Court in American Banana Co. vs. United Fruit Co. (213 U. S., 347). The parties to that litigation were both corporations of the United States.

Long before the plaintiff was formed the defendant, with intent to prevent competition and to control and monopolize the banana trade, bought the property and business of several of its previous competitors with provision against their resuming the trade, made contracts with others regulating the quantity to be purchased and the price to be paid, and acquired a controlling amount of stock in still others. It organized a selling company, of which it held the stock, that by agreement sold at fixed prices all the bananas of the combining parties. By

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this and other means it did monopolize and restrain the trade and maintained unreasonable prices (p. 354).

One McConnell in 1903 started a banana plantation in Colombia and began to build a railway so as to export his product. "Two months later, it is believed at the defendant's instigation, the Governor of Panama recommended to his national Government that Costa Rica be allowed to administer the territory through which the railway was to run" (p. 354), which recommendation was shortly thereafter acted upon. Thereafter the plaintiff bought out McConnell, and when he was proceeding with the work, "Costa Rican soldiers and officials instigated by the defendant seized a part of the plantation and a cargo of supplies and have held them ever since and stopped the construction and operation of the plantation and railway" (pp. 354-5). The efforts of the plaintiff to induce the Government of Costa Rica to withdraw its soldiers and to persuade the United States to interfere were thwarted by the defendant, and the plaintiff was kept out of possession of its property to the time of the commencement of the suit which was begun to recover threefold damages under the act to protect trade against monopolies (the Sherman act).

Speaking for the court, Mr. Justice Holmes said (p. 355): "It is obvious that, however stated, the plaintiff's case depends upon several startling propositions. In the first place, the acts causing the damage were done, so far as appears, outside the jurisdiction of the United States and within that of other states. It is surprising to hear it argued that they were governed by the act of Congress."

After considering the instances where the Federal Government will exercise jurisdiction over Americans guilty of wrongful acts without the United States, the court says (p. 357):

> It is true that domestic corporations remain always within the power of the domestic law, but in the present case, at least, there is no ground for distinguishing between corporations and men, [and] we think it entirely plain that what the defendant did in Panama and Costa Rica is not within the scope of the statute so far as the present suit is concerned. . . . For again, not only were the acts of the defendant in Panama or Costa Rica not within the Sherman act, but they were not torts by the law of the place and therefore were not torts at all, however contrary to the ethical and economic postulates of that statute.

Finally the court said (p. 359): "A conspiracy in this country to do acts in another jurisdiction does not draw to itself those acts and make them unlawful, if they are permitted by the local law."

The judgment dismissing the complaint was unanimously affirmed, Mr. Justice Harlan concurring in the result.

BENJAMIN TUSKA

*New York, January 15*

## THE LATE E. A. ABBEY, R.A.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Having been invited by Mrs. Abbey to write a memoir of the late E. A. Abbey, R.A., may I ask such of your readers as have letters from that artist, and are willing to lend them for possible publication, to send them to me at Chelsea Lodge, 42 Tite Street, London, S. W., where they will be carefully handled, copied, and quickly returned?

E. V. LUCAS

*London, January 6*

# BOOKS

## A World Without War

*The Problem of Human Peace.* Studied from the standpoint of scientific Catholicism. By Malcolm Quin. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 7s. 5d. net.

BY a "Human Peace" Mr. Quin means "a peace brought about and upheld by the foresight and consent of the chief nations of mankind—a peace inspired by the common conviction that international concord is a human good and a good so universal and commending that its pursuit and maintenance ought properly to control all objects of policy" (p. 81). And in the present volume he exhibits to us the "Modern Mind" in the process of employing the "science" at its command—"in other words, the developed reason of man, resting on the sum of human experience, outer and inner, and interpreting that experience by definite methods" (p. 66)—to determine how far this "Human Peace" may "be held to be desirable," "to discuss its possibility," and to "examine our means for bringing it about and maintaining it" (p. 79).

The argument is upon the familiar Positivist lines and is conducted with an opulence of repetition and a solemnity in the discovery and assertion of the undisputed that suggests, on the part of the author, years either few in number or passed in rigorous seclusion from men and things. Nowhere does one get from his pages the tang of reality; he handles his "notions" as if they were algebraic formulæ. Perhaps this is not altogether unnatural in a philosophic descendant of Auguste Comte, but in these days we expect something a little more directly in contact with life as it is and as we know it. However, Mr. Quin finds by "scientific" reasoning that a "Human Peace" is "desirable" and "possible." By long and laborious excursions he discovers that it is "imperialism" of either a "political" or an "industrial" character that leads to wars, and that wars are not merely unnecessary to the complete fulfilment of human life, regarded "Positively," but are in effect very harmful thereto. It is at least encouraging to find that our own vague suspicions on the matter are thus confirmed by the "Modern Mind." Furthermore, he demonstrates, by rigorously "scientific" argument, that the problem is to educate the opinion of mankind to the point of recognizing peace to be a supreme good to be achieved and cherished at all costs. Some of our bright, intuitive thinkers not of the "Positivist" school have even suspected that too; the idea has at least been suggested.

Students of Marx will remember his boast that he had taken Hegel, stood him on his head, and made a materialistic system of the famous "Hegelian dialectic" to serve as the basis for his economic theory. Mr. Quin has done something of the same kind to his philosophic progenitor, Auguste Comte. This philosopher imagined a "religion of humanity" modelled on the Roman Catholic Church which should have an elaborate system of doctrine, ritual, and hagiology to satisfy man's desire for things of this sort. There was even to be a "pontiff," and it is commonly supposed that Comte "saw himself in the part." This was upon the hypothesis that the Catholic Church would vanish from the earth. Now Mr. Quin does not find it necessary to invent a new religion; he can "see" the Catholic Church in that "part." He believes that there is in Catholi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cism "a universal positive content . . . spontaneously expressed in empirical and symbolic forms" (p. 18), and that the "Modern Mind" can operate upon this content "to interpret and supplement" it (*ibid.*). He says:

> It sees in Catholicism an order not to be subverted, but to be developed. It brings to bear on it principles of criticism and comparison, of rejection and acceptance, as it brings them to bear on any other religion or on any other product of culture. It sees it in its relation to the total mind and life of man, and, finding in it truth amidst error, goodness amidst evil, weakness amidst strength, ugliness amidst beauty, and acquisition of real experience and reason expressed spontaneously and symbolically, it exercises its own analytic and constructive power to discern, to preserve, and to complete. In other words, it "chooses" to retain Catholicism, but chooses also to make it scientific (p. 28).

The dealings of the "Modern Mind" with Catholicism, it seems, Mr. Quin has described in a volume prior to that now under notice. It has not been the good fortune of this reviewer to see his earlier book. Nevertheless, it is possible to glean from the present volume a general idea of the process which "science" will find to be necessary. A fair notion can be had from the following passage wherein is defined what is meant by "Scientific Catholicism":

> We mean by it, first, that the Modern Mind, being synthetic—holding within itself the powers, experiences, and acquisitions of a total humanity, past and present—is of sovereign authority, and that to this mind it now falls to determine the sense of such words as "God," "Christ," the Trinity, sin, the Scriptures, the "future life," the creeds, prayer, the sacraments, and the Church. We mean by it, secondly, that to the Modern Mind Catholicism, throughout its entire range, is the confession and pursuit of an ideal perfection, individual and social—a perfection continuously centred and symbolized in Christ as God, but not to be limited by the conception of His Divinity proper to any one age or stage of Catholic development (pp. 50, 51).

One gathers from other passages that in "Scientific Catholicism" Christ will be the symbol or image of "Humanity," and thus we are back again with Comte. In point of fact, Mr. Quin's "Scientific Catholicism" is a "religion of Humanity," no more and no less, but Mr. Quin provides for the metamorphosis of the Catholic Church and not for its elimination.

*When* it is metamorphosed, it will be its duty to educate the world—beginning with Europe—and then the "Human Peace" will follow. It is all perfectly logical. For as Mr. Quin says in his preface, "if it is not to come from the Church," where is it to come from? The human heart must be changed if we are to have peace, and the only force in the world that Mr. Quin sees equal to the task is "the Church." So there you are!

If it be not a shamelessly Philistine confession to make, the reviewer is willing to aver that from his earliest days of philosophic dalliance to the present day Auguste Comte and his philosophic brood have been utterly suspect for one reason more than all else, and that is the preternatural and mournful solemnity that seems to wrap them all as in a funereal pall. It is matter of historic tradition that St. Thomas Aquinas composed and recited very good "limericks" in his hours of recreation and that they were highly appreciated by his brethren. Perhaps this was one reason why he did not seek to invent a new religion or turn an existing religion inside out. Mr. Quin invariably capitalizes the "Modern Mind" whenever he refers to it. At least this helps to break the shock of what follows, for it is fair warning!

## Marshall the Federalist

*The Life of John Marshall.* By Albert J. Beveridge. Vol. I, 1755-1788. Vol. II, 1789-1801. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $8 net.

MR. BEVERIDGE has taken very seriously the task of writing an elaborate life of John Marshall. He evidently wishes not to be thought less thorough, less accurate, or less scientific than any historical doctor of them all; has therefore spared no pains in ransacking all the libraries for material, printed and unprinted, bearing on his subject; has studied, sifted, and arranged all this material with much system; and, in his presentation, has forestalled all reasonable criticism by giving chapter and verse for almost everything he ventures to say. One might indeed suppose, judging from the book itself, that the author was a professor of history in some university or other; in scholarship the performance does not fall below, or in style rise above, the level upon which we ordinarily expect to meet the professional historian.

One is likely to think the life of Marshall must be a long story if eleven hundred pages are required to bring the tale to the year 1801. Mr. Beveridge would reply that this is precisely the period in Marshall's life most needing to be emphasized, because, in the first place, what Marshall did "before ascending the Supreme Bench has been almost entirely forgotten," and because, in the second place, "his greatest decisions cannot be wholly understood without considering his previous life and experience." And in order to make clear the nature of this experience, Mr. Beveridge has thought it necessary to do something more than merely relate very fully all that is known about Marshall; he has thought it necessary to describe at some length, and in a general way, certain aspects of American society. As an example, one may cite chapter four of the first volume, which describes in forty pages, and very admirably, the wretched state of the revolutionary army; or chapter seven, which portrays with a wealth of concrete detail social conditions in the States at the close of the war. In neither of these chapters, however, is Marshall more than occasionally mentioned.

The purpose of all this elaboration is, of course, to find outside of the man himself, in his "experience" and in the pressure of the social environment in which he lived, an explanation of his political ideas and conduct. What Mr. Beveridge is intent upon making his reader understand is why Marshall became a Federalist and strong government man, over against which he sets the interesting fact that Marshall's great antagonist, Jefferson, who was also a Virginian, and a back-country Virginian, too, remained a Democrat and a States' rights man. The explanation is essentially that Marshall's experience as soldier in the Revolution modified his original frontier radicalism by convincing him that a stronger government was highly necessary, and that he was confirmed in this idea by the anarchical situation that developed during the period of the Confederation. Jefferson, on the contrary, never was a soldier under Washington, and during the crucial period of the Confederation he was in France. Therefore, "the vagaries, the changeableness, the turbulence, the envy towards those who had property, the tendency to repudiate debts, the readiness to credit the grossest slanders or to respond to the most fantastic promises, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the newly liberated people of America were then displaying, did not come within Jefferson's vision or experience."

In so far as a man's opinions can be referred to environment, it may be said at once that Mr. Beveridge enables his readers to understand very well why Marshall became a Federalist. He indeed makes little, too little, perhaps, from his own point of view, of the fact, which Professor Beard makes so much of, that Marshall's liking for strong government may have been due to his close personal relation, in a business and professional way, with the people of wealth and social position. Marshall's political convictions, Mr. Beveridge admits, "were in harmony with his business connections and social environment." But he thinks that Marshall "would have taken the same stand had none of these circumstances developed." Very likely he would. But then very likely he would have taken the same stand had he never been a soldier in the Revolution. Very likely he would still have been a Federalist had he been in France with Jefferson. Residence in France did not make a Democrat of Gouverneur Morris, nor did the anarchy of the Confederation make a Federalist of Patrick Henry. It is as true to say that Marshall was in the army because he was Marshall as it is to say that he was Marshall because he was in the army. "Where is Jefferson?" asked Washington in the dark days of the war. Jefferson was not in the army. Being Jefferson, he would naturally not be in the army, would have been very little good there, and would, in any case, have been the same Jefferson that we know.

Perhaps the truth is that extraordinary men like Marshall and Jefferson are not to be understood in terms of environment. It would be difficult to conceive of an environment in which Marshall would have thought and acted as Jefferson thought and acted. With this sort of men the decisive thing is the individual temperament, the personality, the innate slant of the mind, or whatever term it is that best describes those inherited characteristics which react to the pressure of the external world but are not created by it. Perhaps Mr. Beveridge would quite agree that this is so; but if it is so, then one must say that the chief defect of his book, as a professed life of Marshall, is precisely that the central figure of the picture, the very object which he wishes to accentuate and to define, is obscured by too great elaboration of the setting; the reader almost loses sight of Marshall, so much is he invited to consider the circumstances that made him what he was.

It is true, the material for an intimate knowledge of Marshall is not great, and does not, when you have got it together, prove to be as satisfactory as one could wish. Marshall was not a great self-revealer. He was not given to introspection; never, probably, took his ideas out of his head, as it were, to see what they might be like, regarded objectively. One may read his letters without ever suspecting that he was an extraordinary man. Neither in form nor in content are they in any way remarkable. Contemporaries noted the fact that Marshall was mentally an indolent person; did not get under way easily; but, once under way, swept along with great power. He possesses "great subtlety of mind," says Judge Story, "but it is only occasionally exhibited." The quality of his mind was exhibited in fact only when there was some particular task to be done, such as making an important speech or writing a crucial decision. Contemporaries tell us also that Marshall was an interesting personality. We have to take their word for it. Very little that is strikingly characteristic, in speech or action, has been preserved to reveal to us this interesting personality. It is difficult to know a character who has done so little to reveal himself as Marshall; and we shall in fact never know him as we know men like Franklin, or Jefferson, or John Adams, or even Washington. Nevertheless, it should be possible for a biographer, having all the material at hand, knowing how to reject, with a gift for subtle psychological analysis of character, practiced in the fine art of revealing an individual by telling the story of his life, to give us, in a moderate volume, a much clearer idea of Marshall than Mr. Beveridge has done.

This is only to say that Mr. Beveridge has not written one of the great biographies. The masterpieces of biography are soon numbered; and we willingly take the present book for what it is, a very full compendium of all the information about Marshall and the times in which he lived, all related accurately enough, and on the whole in an interesting manner. We therefore welcome Mr. Beveridge, in case he does not resent being tarred with that stick, into the guild of professional historians, among whom, taking them by and large, he will rank well above the average; and we await with interest the completion of his life of Marshall, which he has promised "as soon as the nature of the task permits."

## Current Fiction

*Damaris.* By Lucas Malet. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

MRS. HARRISON'S work is not growing stronger with the years. Her force, such as it was, reached its climax in "Sir Richard Calmady." The close and enervating atmosphere with which it was fated to struggle has now fairly proved too much for it. This story is unwholesome, it has the odor of sex. With all its fine phrases and its straining after fine emotion, it never for a moment escapes from the stuffy and perfumed chamber of a sterile eroticism. The presence of the stage-child Damaris does not succeed in restraining or purifying the action. Her father is a great British official in India, a man of extraordinary personal beauty and force. This is an account of his elaborate and fruitless philandering with a pretty married woman whom he has secretly loved for years, and who now puts herself fairly in his power. He is decidedly a woman's hero, a terrifying male, with a gift for spouting which in real life would make him a thing of laughter for other men. The plain truth is, we do not believe in him; and it is singularly irritating to have a man of straw and sacking set up before us to the end of imputing to him wild and mysterious passions. Henrietta, the endangered lady, is by far the better of the two, but the Commissioner Sahib scorns her for escaping; and we leave him in the act of dismissing her idea with a contemptuous gesture—here, you notice, the child motive is lugged in at last, by the heels: "I resign the Commissionership," mouths the man of straw, "I accept the offer from Cabul.—And—this for Henrietta Pereira, should you care to report it—it may act as an inducement, as a sedative, as—well—delicate flattery to her self-esteem—if the child's life is granted me, as an act at once of thanksgiving and of expiation, I have sworn, God helping me, never again to touch a woman; but cast out the lust of flesh, the lust of the eyes, from this day forward

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the end." And this, on the whole, is the great moment of the story!

*Rodmoor.* By John Cowper Powys. New York: G. Arnold Shaw.

ANOTHER book of morbid and not over-clean imaginings is this new story by the eccentric author of "Wood and Stone." Rodmoor is a place of subtle evil, a desolate coast village where life holds no happiness or sweetness for any human dweller. Fate assembles there for us an assortment of strange characters: a bibulous priest with the face of a satyr and the heart of an unhappy child; a connoisseur of literature, of art, and of the mental and moral aberrations of his fellowmen; a physician, given to innocent philanderings with nature and fair women; a local Rochester or Heathcliff (the narrative is inscribed to the author of "Wuthering Heights") with hinted-at capacities for unspeakable evil; his sister, an hermaphroditic creature of uncanny charms; a half-insane author; and a number of hapless women, young and old, who are destined, in one way or another, to pay the price of their association with Rodmoor and its baleful humanity. And with these pleasant materials the narrator's fancy plays humorously, introducing us to quaint Peacockian symposia, to freakish situations and hideous eventualities—all with the same genial air of a Mephistopheles showman, daring us not to laugh at his grisly exhibits. The scene falls upon an orgy of insanity, suicide, and despair such as the deadliest Russian naturalism might well envy. It is a diabolically brilliant performance, but to what end? That, no doubt, is what the performer meant to prod us into asking.

*Kildares of Storm.* By Eleanor Mercein Kelly. New York: The Century Co.

KENTUCKY, one is inclined to say, has had less than the prominence which it deserves in American fiction. There are James Lane Allen, of course, and John Fox, jr.; but it is not easy to name another novelist so distinctively of Kentucky. In dealing with life on the edge of the mountain region, Mrs. Kelly has the advantage of a fresh and highly interesting field which she knows intimately. To the bleak old hall, which is the ancestral home of the Kildares, has come Kate, at seventeen, as the bride of Basil Kildare, a hard-drinking, fox-hunting country squire more than twice her age, and, as she soon finds, essentially a brute. She bears him two daughters; but meanwhile falls in love with Dr. Jacques Benoit, a Creole gentleman, who has come to the region for his wife's health. Basil meets a violent death under doubtful circumstances, and Benoit, convicted of his murder, is sentenced to life imprisonment. Soon afterwards his wife dies. All this is in the past of the story proper, in which Kate Kildare and her two grown daughters are the central characters. Kate's efficient management has more than doubled the value of the estate and has made her rich. She has never ceased to work and hope for Benoit's pardon, and has watched over his son as a member of her own family. When the pardon is at last gained, Benoit, broken in health and fearing to be a burden to Kate, disappears. Meantime his son Philip, grown to manhood, has fallen in love with Kate, who plans to marry him to her daughter Jacqueline. But Jacqueline's love has been gained by a clever and worthless young novelist from the East. Here are the complications for a lively story, and the story is there; but what remains in the reader's memory is the portrait group of the three women, Kate Kildare and her daughters. The men, as so often in novels written by women, are either scoundrels or quixotic saints; but the three women are wonderfully alive. The vitality and force of these characters make the story noteworthy and give promise of greater achievement for the author.

*The Home Coming.* By Constance Holme. New York: Robert M. McBride & Co.

THE literary feat here accomplished is a rare one. A novel of modern manners is woven around a ghostly family tradition, a legendary curse made quite credible amid the busy round of social and philanthropic duties, and the decorous pauses of drawing-room tragedy filled with a poetical accompaniment of countryside superstition. The marvel is that such a tale could be kept true in all its bearings, that its imaginative effects are never obtained at the expense of reality of character or situation. The unifying element is the author's sure understanding of the spirit that is England. It makes her work a national interpretation, the more veracious and complete because so beautifully touched with the legendary hues of tragic romance.

## The Ancient East and West

*Intercourse between India and the Western World from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Rome.* By H. G. Rawlinson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.25.

THE subject of Professor Rawlinson's book has always intrigued classical scholars and students of early Indian history. Hitherto the translations of Dr. J. W. McCrindle have been the most convenient collection, and Professor Rawlinson, while using these, many of which need annotation owing to recent archæological, numismatic, and epigraphic discoveries, professes to have traced every passage in Greek and Roman literature on the subject of India. Likewise he is indebted, as are all writers on the early history of India, to the invaluable work of Mr. Vincent A. Smith. Those interested in the relations of East and West revived by the war will find Professor Rawlinson's book a useful and entertaining guide to a necessary and picturesque background. It remains for some scholar of similar enthusiasm to give us a volume embracing India's Far Eastern relations, based as they are on sources less slender and more trustworthy than many of these classical records—those of the Chinese writers Fa-hien, Hiuen Tsang, and other Buddhist pilgrims.

It was through Persia that India came into contact with the Greeks, and a strong Persian influence impressed itself upon her civilization. The excavations at Patna, the ancient capital Pātaliputra, have revealed, together with a Greek artistic influence, a strong Persepolitan impress. At Ajantā Mr. Vincent Smith identified a fresco depicting the reception of a Persian embassy as far south as a Deccan court in 625 A. D. The first Indian reference, naturally to the Gandhāra district, is found in Darius's Persepolis and Naksh-i-Rustam inscriptions, and it was Darius who sent the first Greek to India. In the fifth century B. C. Skylax of Karyanda explored for him the Indus to its delta and made the voyage through the Red Sea to Suez. Augmented by the reports of Persian officials returned from the Pan-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jāb, Herodotus used the fragments of Skylax's diary for the first Greek work on India, in which Professor Rawlinson finds a reference to the Buddhists. Ktēsias, a Greek physician at Sūsa, had excellent opportunities for collecting material on the twentieth satrapy of the Empire from the officials and soldiers he met at the court, but his "Indika" merely gave vogue to the sort of extravagance that was raised to a fine art by mediæval peripatetics.

Thus the Greeks learned of India first through Persia, but it was only after the results of Alexander's invasion in 327 B. C. (not, as Professor Rawlinson states, 329 B. C.) were felt in the West that accurate news reached them. The diaries of Alexander's officers, the tales of his soldiers and sailors, whipped their aroused curiosity. In the second century A. D. Arrian collected this material on Alexander's campaigns, and wrote a description of India from all available sources. It was after Alexander's prestige had waned before the organized empire of Chandragupta, and the vain attempt of Seleukos Nikator to emulate his master had collapsed, that all ideas of a Greek conquest of India gave way to the nice maintenance of diplomatic and trade relations. Of Bindusāra, Chandragupta's successor, a well-known story is told. He requested of Antiochus Soter (not of Seleukos, the father, as Professor Rawlinson relates) some figs, raisin wine, and a Sophist, to which the Syrian monarch, in sending the figs and wine, politely intimated that the Greeks didn't trade in philosophers. Thus Seleukos sent Megasthenes and later Deïmachos as ambassadors, while Dionysios came from Ptolemy Philadelphus to the Maurya court. All three diplomats recorded their Indian impressions. But the detailed and fairly accurate account of Indian institutions and customs by Megasthenes (circa 300 B. C.), together with the Asiatic log-journal (circa 80 A. D.) of the anonymous sailor-author of the "Periplus of the Erythræan Sea," once wrongly ascribed to Arrian, are the only Greek records of any value. On matters of internal economy and the structure of society in the Maurya Empire, Professor Hopkins has shown that the statements of Megasthenes are often at variance with trustworthy Indian chronicles. The subsequent Greek and semi-Greek dynasties of the Panjāb and their widespread colonies in India insured constant and intimate communication with the West until the irruption of the Arabs. Greek was spoken in the Indian *bāzārs*, and the beautiful Indo-Greek coins still found in the Panjāb, together with the much-discussed sculptures of the Gandhāra school, attest to a once notable Greek culture.

An enormous trade existed by sea between Rome and India, contributed largely to the prestige of Alexandria as the great *entrepôt*, and lasted through the later Sassanian empire until the Arab conquest of Syria and Egypt. Discussing the traces of Western culture in India, Professor Rawlinson naturally emphasizes what survives, a purely artistic influence.

> As regards Indian art we may at once say that in the matter of *coinage*, Indians learnt everything from the West. Coinage never appealed to the Hindu craftsman very strongly. . . . The Indians were usually content either to imitate foreign coins, generally the Roman *aureus*, or to restrike them. . . . In the south of India they took the simpler course of importing Roman specie wholesale. . . . Before Alexander, punch-marked coins were alone issued in India, though Persian and Athenian coins were in circulation in the satrapy of the Panjāb.

Professor Rawlinson defends the contribution of the Gandhāra sculptures. The subject has become controversial through the too-emphatic claims of rival camps: the power of a Greek or Western inspiration set against a purely indigenous Indian art, such as is exemplified in the Gupta period. At least we are certain that the Græco-Roman school of Gandhāra supplied to Buddhism a vitality not at first inherent in that art-loving creed. For Gandhāran influences suggested a Hellenistic cast that permeated mediæval Indian art, and penetrated to Ceylon and Java, while another strain reached China, Korea, and Japan through Central Asia. But the important innovation made through Gandhāra was the artistic conception of the Buddha in human form, and having Apollo for its prototype. The few errors in the book are due to the inaccessibility of a good library in India, where the author holds a chair in an Indian college.

## Mr. Winter's Shakespeare

*Shakespeare on the Stage.* Third Series. By William Winter. New York: Moffat, Yard & Company. $3 net.

IN this volume, the third in his comprehensive work, Mr. Winter deals with eight of Shakespeare's plays, "Cymbeline," "Love's Labour's Lost," "Coriolanus," "A Midsummer Night's Dream," "King Henry IV," "The Merry Wives of Windsor," "Antony and Cleopatra," and "King John." Like its predecessors it is, considering the author's years, an amazing exhibition of scrupulous care, ripe scholarship, and industry. It is really encyclopædic in character, a digest of the most trustworthy records and commentaries concerning the plays, their origin, date, and manner of representation in Great Britain and America; the names, methods, and capacities of the principal and many of the lesser players engaged in their interpretation from Elizabethan days to the present era, with the amplest details of time and place, descriptions of costume and scenery, and a vast amount of miscellaneous information, incident, and anecdote. The facts in it, of course, are not new, but, collected as they are from many different sources, they offer valuable facilities for reference.

Apart from this aspect of the volume, especial value and interest attach to the purely personal contribution of Mr. Winter which constitutes the greater half. With some of his critical appreciations of actors of the last two generations, not every reader—certainly not the present writer—will be in the fullest agreement, but when he discusses the proper functions of the theatre, the principles of the great art of acting, and the inherent quality, literary or dramatic, of plays or characters, he speaks with the authority of a wide experience and the knowledge of a keen student. In his preface is a notably sound exposition of the common-sense principles upon which a representative, national theatre ought to be conducted. Most thoughtful persons will acquiesce in his dictum that any institution of the kind, to fulfil its true purpose, ought to be run under private, not official, direction. He is eminently right, too, when he argues that, in stage representation, judicious editing of the Shakespearean text is both commendable and expedient. Nothing is gained, and much positive harm is done, by the retention of irrelevant or inferior passages.

It is pleasant to find the author dealing, in good set terms, with the ridiculous heresy, so dearly cherished by second-rate performers, that the player should, in his own

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proper person, "feel" the emotions which he is supposed to be portraying. Acting, in its true sense, is the embodiment of an imaginary character—generally differing very widely from that of the interpreter—in accordance with a conception of it formed by a process of intellectual and creative reasoning. To vitalize it the natural instincts, impulses, and habits of the actor must be subject to the dominant control of his intellect and will. If he lets his emotions run away with him habitually, he will never present any other personality than his own, and this is just why the vast majority of contemporary mimes reiterate themselves with such dreadful sameness. Mr. Winter quotes in this connection an illuminating anecdote: As Leontes, in "The Winter's Tale," Macready, in the statue scene, so overwhelmed the young Helena Faucit (his Hermione) with the vehemence of his simulated emotion that she nearly broke down, until he reassured her by bidding her, in a smiling aside—without a moment's abatement of his apparent agitation—not to be frightened.

Admirable is Mr. Winter's exposition of the structure and moral and dramatic qualities of plays, and his keen and appreciative analyses of the poet's characters. His study of Coriolanus is excellent, and so is his analysis of the fascinating character of Falstaff, in all its complicated yet harmonious phases. Most interesting and valuable, also, is his minute and nicely critical description of the impersonation of the fat knight by the late James H. Hackett, undoubtedly one of the best on record. This, be it noted, was a life-long study.

Every student of Shakespeare and the stage will hope that Mr. Winter may have health and strength to finish the monumental work that he has projected.

# Notes

"THE Middle Pasture," by Mathilde Bilbro, is announced for publication this month by Small, Maynard & Company.

"Sea Warfare" and "A Diversity of Creatures," both by Rudyard Kipling, will be published shortly by Doubleday, Page & Company.

Henry Holt & Company announce the forthcoming publication of "Little Theatres in the United States," by Constance D'Arcy Mackay. Professor Dewey's "Creative Intelligence" and Professor Hazen's "Modern European History" are also announced by this firm.

The Scribners' announcements for this month include: "The Celt and the World," by Shane Leslie; "Hidden Happiness," by Stephen Berrien Stanton; "Short Sixes" and "More Short Sixes" (two new volumes of "The Stories of H. C. Bunner"), and "The Justification of God," by T. P. Forsyth.

The Macmillan Company announces the following as just published or forthcoming: "Italy, France, and Britain at War," by H. G. Wells; "The Cycle of Spring," by Rabindranath Tagore; "Regiment of Women," by Clemence Dane; "A Soldier of Life," by Hugh de Selincourt; "Changing Winds," by St. John G. Ervine; "The Apostles' Creed Today," by Edward S. Drown; "The Celtic Dawn," by Lloyd R. Morris.

The Lippincotts will publish this month "Joseph Pennell's Pictures of War Work in England."

ALTHOUGH John Muir's "A Thousand Mile Walk to the Gulf" (Houghton Mifflin; $2.50 net) was not prepared for publication by the author himself, it does not differ much in form or style from his "My First Summer in the Sierra." In point of time, it fills the gap between "The Story of My Boyhood and Youth" and "My First Summer in the Sierra," a period of not much more than half a year. Beginning his botanical walk in September, 1867, soon after the war, he found everywhere "the ineffaceable marks of the farthest-reaching and most infernal of all civilized calamities," himself suffering the consequences through danger of assault and robbery by negroes, white highwaymen, and guerrilla bands that had not yet mustered themselves out, and more especially through the lack of hospitality engendered by such conditions. Again and again he went supperless and breakfastless, again and again he was obliged to seek what shelter he could find at night, lucky if he came upon a log schoolhouse and could choose "the softest looking of the benches," for he was frequently obliged to sleep out-of-doors without so much as a blanket to ward off the dew. At Savannah he had an experience typical enough of his adventurous life. Nearly penniless through not finding there the money which he had ordered from home, he nevertheless enjoyed the most impressive "company of trees" he had ever seen—"the tillandsia-draped oaks of Bonaventure"—and at nightful sought sleep and security in the graveyard, resting "fairly well" despite the mosquitoes and "large prickly-footed beetles creeping across my hands and face," and rising in the morning to find that his pillow had been a grave. Next day he arranged a kind of nest with a roof, and resorted to the cemetery nightly thereafter. By the time the money arrived he was "staggery and giddy." Lack of identification brought a new difficulty, which he surmounted by strategy, and then, pocketing his wealth, he went out in quest of food, meeting, happily, "a very large negro woman with a tray of gingerbread," and enjoying, after the gingerbread, "a large regular meal." In Florida he became desperately ill; when the fever left him, he was seriously weakened. Nothing daunted, he sailed for Cuba. Told by the captain to go below, he replied that he hoped the storm would be as violent as the ship could bear, for he "enjoyed the scenery of such a sea so much that it was impossible to be sick." In Cuba his health failed to return, and he was obliged to give up his foolish dream of walking through the jungles of South America along the Andes to a tributary of the Amazon, and then floating down that river on a raft all the way to the Atlantic! Needless to say, the book abounds in Muir's unbridled enthusiasm, in happy descriptions of scenes and persons and manners, and in earnest Scotch moralizing on man's blindness to beauty and man's egotistic interpretation of nature.

A REPRINT, from President Wilson's "Constitutional Government in the United States," of the chapter entitled "The President of the United States" is published by Harper (50 cents net). A rereading of the chapter now, in the light of the author's course as President, does not change the opinion which we expressed at the time of its first publication, in 1908. That the President, by the circumstances of his election as well as by the nature of his office, is at once the spokesman of the people as well as the leader of his party; that it is to him, rather than to Congress, that the country looks for suggestion and guidance;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that it is his right not only to urge his views upon Congress, but also to use every legitimate means to obtain from Congress the legislation necessary to make public opinion effective, no one, we fancy, will question. The office of President, as Mr. Wilson rightly points out, is as influential as its incumbent chooses to make it. The difficulty lies in the application of the theory. If "the people" have spoken, well and good; but what if they have not spoken? May the President then assume to voice what, by inference at least, he professes to believe the people would say if they had a chance, proclaim his dictum as the undoubted opinion of the nation, and force it upon Congress whether that body agrees with him or not? Such was Jackson's course with the Bank of the United States; such was Mr. Wilson's course last summer with the threatened railway strike. Where, in Mr. Wilson's theory, does the deliberative function of Congress come in? After all that has been said about the "new freedom," we still have a Federal Constitution, one of whose primary provisions is the coördinate position of the Legislature and the executive. No one will dispute Mr. Wilson's contention that the Constitution of the United States "is not a mere lawyer's document"; but exactly what does he mean when he adds, in the same breath, that "it is a vehicle of life, and its spirit is always the spirit of the age," and that "life is always your last and most authoritative critic"? The phrases are resounding, but do they really imply anything more profound than the politician's philosophy of keeping one's ear to the ground?

THERE has been no history of Poland in the English language that is even remotely satisfactory. Morfill's work in the Story of the Nations series is a hasty and superficial compilation. Prof. Julia Swift Orvis, in "A Brief History of Poland" (Houghton Mifflin; $1.50 net), has attempted to fill this gap, relying for her material on secondary sources, none of them in the Polish language, with which she is apparently unacquainted. To sketch in 332 small pages the fortunes through a thousand years of a great people that has had a peculiar and exceptional development, both in prosperity and in misfortune, requires careful choice of details and rigorous subordination of single events to general tendencies. In attacking this problem Professor Orvis has shown varying skill; she deserves credit for even partial success in so difficult a task. Of the first half of her book, which treats of the history of Poland down to the death of Augustus III in 1763, the best that can be said is that it is superior to Morfill's handling of the same theme. In her brief chronicle the names of kings, foreign wars, constitutional changes, and religious movements jostle one another in a confusion that is not even picturesque. No single topic emerges in definite outline. The second half of the volume, beginning with an excellent sketch of Polish society in the eighteenth century, and proceeding with an account of the partitions and the history of the Polish people under foreign rule, is of different sort, being clear, well-ordered, and interesting. As a fitting climax, it conducts the reader to a definite understanding of the relations of the Poles to the present war. Of Polish literature Professor Orvis writes six lines:

> The Jagiellon period is also Poland's great literary age. Her language during this period took on its modern literary form, and a great national literature gave it permanence and expressed the nation's sense of its own expanding life (p. 97).

This is, to say the least, misleading: the Jagiellon period was 1386-1572, while the great literary age of independent Poland was roughly 1550-1650, during which time the nation passed from expansion to incipient decay. But the greatest literature of Poland grew up after the partitions, in the first half of the nineteenth century; it has been a chief factor in preserving the national consciousness of the Polish people. Not to allude to its existence is a mistake even on the part of an historian of social and political conditions. Errors of detail occur: Lokietek (p. 38), the nickname of a Polish king, means not "Long-Span," but "Shorty"; the Constitution of May 3, 1791, did not abolish serfdom (p. 221), but only took the serfs under the protection of the law, thereby giving them protection from the caprice and cruelty of their masters; Poland is not "the most western of all Slav lands" (p. 304).

IN his latest book, "The Germans" (Putnam; $2 net), Mr. J. M. Robertson presents his "views concerning German evolution" by refuting the German claim to preëminence through racial superiority and by tracing the process which transformed the idealistic cosmopolitan Germany of the late eighteenth century into the "self-worshipping" Germany of the last forty years. Mr. Robertson's comfortable assumption that his views "cannot be reasonably charged with cultivating the spirit of national antagonism" breaks again and again on the wheel of his own narrative. "Rant," "crowning absurdity," "puerile prejudice," and many other similar expressions, applied to German men and works of high standing, will hardly draw Germans closer to Mr. Robertson and his fellow Britons. Nor will Germans overlook misinterpretations and misstatements of fact. It is even amusing, for example, to find (p. 179) Mr. Robertson interpreting Lessing's bitter irony as solemn earnestness and to read (p. 190) the unqualified statement that German literature in the time of Frederick the Great was "something still inchoate." Indeed, few pages of Mr. Robertson's book are spared the stains of the war. This is regrettable, for the author's conception of German evolution is essentially true beyond any doubt.

ONE cannot but regret the bitter tone of John Quincy Adams's "The Birth of Mormonism" (Boston: Richard Badger; $1 net), and the more because no such heated attack upon the early performances of Joseph Smith and his associates was needed to discredit them. Those, however, who, like the author, regard Mormonism as "the greatest religious fraud of the nineteenth century, if not of all time," and who wish to see the devious career of its founder laid bare, will doubtless read the book with zest. Professor Adams says that he used sources "not ordinarily accessible and possibly no longer in existence"; but, aside from some out-of-the-way pamphlets, his brief bibliography contains little that is not known to special students of the subject. Some notes and extracts from the rare *Nauvoo Expositor*, and from newspapers of 1844-45, given in an appendix, preserve interesting bits of contemporary description.

DOUGLAS DEWAR'S past books on Indian bird-life have been of general appeal, from the point of view both of literature and of natural history. The present volume, "Birds of the Indian Hills" (Lane; $2 net), has a narrower scope, being an annotated handbook of Himalayan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

birds with shorter chapters on the birds of the Nilgiris and the Palni Hills. Only the most common forms are mentioned, and their division into families makes them easy of reference. Several brief chapters on individual species are of wider interest, but on the whole the volume is of use chiefly to the Anglo-Indian or tourist. The scientific names show evidence of exceedingly careless proofreading, while much valuable paper and ink are consumed in puerile complaints against ornithologists and their taxonomic troubles.

"TRAMPING Through Mexico, Guatemala, and Honduras" (Century; $2 net) has all the excellent qualities and the drawbacks of Mr. Harry A. Franck's earlier books. It is a glorified diary, a calendar of interesting facts dressed in such pleasant phraseology that it is with an effort that one leaves off reading. Even the total omission of dates, of months, and of seasons, too, cannot disguise the journalesque foundation. But Franck is always too hurried. We are ever conscious of the forced marches, of the early risings, of the day-long, perspiring tramps. He is fond of calling himself a vagabond, an idler, a tramp, but that is just what he is not. He is a hybrid—a dynamic, virile personality, aping the itinerant type of real tramp, and his work suffers in consequence. It lacks repose, poise, thought; and hence it is well-nigh devoid of imagination and philosophy. We like him, we enjoy every experience, we feel every sensation which he feels—but we forget it all as soon as we have read it. There is nothing subtle, nothing abstract to give us pause in our headlong rush from the Rio Grande to Amapala. Yet scarcely a page lacks material which might be refined by alchemy of thought into literature that would live. As it is, Mr. Franck has written a literary scenario, has added another title to the vast library of travelogues.

SIR WILLIAM OSLER'S address on "Science and War," delivered at the University of Leeds Medical School on October 1, 1915 (Oxford University Press; 50 cents), makes a pamphlet of but thirty-nine pages, yet it contains more meat than many of the volumes about war and the causes of war with which the book marts have been flooded. History, ancient and modern, and the literature of the ages are utilized by the author to establish his premise that centuries of growth in civilization have not altered the fact that war is to-day, as it has ever been, but the expression of man's most powerful primal instinct. War is inevitable and its character is changed only by the greater horrors made possible by modern engines of war. The attitude of the Athenians and the fate of Melos have found their parallel to-day in Belgium. Dr. Osler is an historical student as well as a litterateur. No other could have at his ready command the salient facts and figures which vivify his pages. Science appears in truth a Frankenstein monster when we read that in all the great wars from 1790 to 1913 together 18,552,200 men were engaged and 5,498,097 killed, while in the present war more than 21 millions are engaged, and at the end of the first year of the war it was estimated that more than ten millions had been killed or wounded or were missing. The airship, the submarine, and the high explosive are responsible for the marvellous efficiency of the twentieth-century fighting machine, and to the development of these instruments of war every "aspect of the subtlest human study" has contributed—chemistry, electricity, physics, optics, mathematics.

WITH an encyclopædic accuracy the various engines of war and the efficiency of each are described. A contrast is afforded in the beautiful description of the Hospital Camp, which the author makes the setting for his portrayal of the brighter aspect of Science. While without ceasing men devise new engines of self-destruction, they have a strange antipathy to the destructive powers of nature herself. "Pestilence has always dogged the footsteps of war," but the menace of the bacillus is being lessened and thwarted by prophylactic methods. Therefore, while Science has given us the submarine, it has produced also the prophylactic serum; over against the airship may be placed the X-ray, the latter, moreover, being more efficient as a life-saver than the former as a death-dealer; and against the high explosive stand the magnificent developments of surgical technique, the newer methods of wound treatment, the conserving anæsthetic. These saving gifts of Science are not all for the wounded, but avail for the promotion of human comfort and the saving of life in peace as well as in war, and it is well that it is so, for if her only service were to save those she has herself destroyed, of what avail her progress! The greatest attribute of Science is her universality. Every nation needs the fruits of the scientific endeavors of every other, and thus, as the author seems to indicate, it may be that when this war shall have passed the influence of Science may become increasingly for peace and against war. The great scientist belongs to the world, and with Dr. Osler we applaud the great-heartedness of those who in the midst of a state of war can still with enthusiasm acclaim such men as Ehrlich, Virchow, and Koch—by nationality the enemies of England, but by their achievements world-citizens.

MR. FREDERIC FAIRCHILD SHERMAN has added to his fastidiously made quartos on American painters "Alexander Wyant," by Eliot Clark ($12.50 net). Wyant is not precisely a grateful figure either for the biographer or the critic. His life was colorless, his habit reticent and unsocial. His art moves within the bounds of a quite restricted color, though rich at times, and of a subdued elegiac mood. He was born at Evans Creek, O., in 1836, early developed a gift for drawing, and was first powerfully stirred by an exhibition of George Inness's work, at Cincinnati, in 1857. To consult Inness he went to New York, but continued on his own account till the acceptance of a landscape in the Academy in 1864 and the generous patronage of Nicholas Longworth heartened him to go to Europe. For a brief space he studied at Karlsruhe with the mediocre Düsseldorfer Hans Gude. He returned by way of England and Ireland, where he painted the best works of his first manner, and settled down to a hard struggle in New York. An evil inspiration, prompted doubtless by the fame of the big mountain picture of Bierstadt, prompted him, in 1873, to join an expedition to the Southwest. His delicate health unfitted him for the hardship of the trip, and he returned half-paralyzed, condemned to paint for the rest of his life with his left hand.

UNDER the influence of Rousseau and Dupré, whom he was one of the first American painters to appreciate, he effected a remarkable and heroic reconstruction of his art. Spending much of his year, first at Keene Valley

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and later at Arkville, in the Catskills, his work progressed in intimacy and his methods in richness. Apparently he looked at nature only under conditions when a saturated air draws the clouds down to meet the mists from the earth, and he became a master of this sort of appearances. There is a quiet and understanding melancholy about his best work which is in a manner merely the fulfilment of that of his predecessor, Jervis McEntee. He never pushed the note to the pathos that was Homer Martin's, nor indulged the exuberance of color and mood which was habitual with Inness. Wyant valued his choice somewhat jealously. Being settled near his friend Inness, and fearing his dominance, he moved his studio. On the whole, his achievement was level and competent, rather than deep or brilliant. He has only occasionally the rarer and more surprising felicities, as in Early Morning, well reproduced in color in this book, in an extraordinary Moonlight in the Hearn collection, and in the powerful picture Driving Mist. Mr. Clark has conducted his analysis with tact, lucidity, and judgment, keeping his evident sympathy under prudent critical reserve. He rightly emphasizes the intimacy and charm of Wyant, while admitting his singular lack of variety. Fifteen photogravure plates, one in colors, represent the work in fine examples of all periods. This presentation of sure and worthy examples would alone give the book distinction and value, for Wyant's pictures have been the occasion of considerable unprincipled repolishing, if not of absolute forgery. The collector of these modest poems needs, therefore, emphatically to be on his guard against the spurious.

THE NATION

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Published and owned by the
NEW YORK EVENING POST COMPANY

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, President. JOHN PALMER GAVIT, Sec. and Treas.

EMIL M. SCHOLZ, Publisher.

Entered at the New York City Post Office as second-class mail matter.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—Four dollars per annum, postpaid, in United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries comprised in the Postal Union, $5.00.

Address, THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, Box 794, New York, Publication Office.

LONDON OFFICE: 16 Regent Street, S. W.
WASHINGTON OFFICE: Home Life Building
CHICAGO OFFICE: 332 South Michigan Avenue
BUENOS AIRES OFFICE: Lavalle 341

HAROLD DE WOLF FULLER, EDITOR.

STANLEY WENT, ASSISTANT EDITOR. PAUL ELMER MORE, ADVISORY EDITOR.

WILLIAM G. PRESTON, ADVERTISING MANAGER. R. B. McCLEAN, BUSINESS MANAGER.

# Notes from the Capital

WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

THE first emergence from the wreck of the Progressive party, in good order and undiminished as to zeal for the future, appears to be William Allen White, of Kansas, the pink cherubic blond who had so large a share in building up the top-heavy structure. "Cherubic," possibly, is not so descriptive a word as "chubby," which one of his biographers has applied to him. That expresses the suggestion conveyed to the mind by his outward man. Everything about him is chubby: his face, his body, his hands, his walk, his mode of speech. Abrim with good health and good nature, he can say or write what from any one else would be taken as vitriolic criticism, yet, ten to one, a glance at him will dispel the victim's resentment. Once in a while occurs an exception. One such was the late "Tom" Platt, for many years the Easy Boss of New York State politics. He was so outraged at White's account of his career and practices, printed in a popular periodical, that he stalked up and down his accustomed haunts for weeks afterwards, vowing that he would sue both magazine and author for libel, and set his damages at a figure which would warn professional defamers to let him alone for the future. He even visited President Roosevelt on a special errand, to protest against White's being allowed any further influence at the White House. But—possibly because some more worldly-wise friend hinted that, if he carried his demand for vengeance too far, White might make it the subject for another article—the Senator decided to drop the idea of a damage suit and content himself with saying disagreeable things about White in newspaper interviews.

Another instance was that of a Mrs. Meffert, who, taking umbrage at some comments published by White on a matter in which she was interested, lay in ambush for him one afternoon with a horsewhip, designing to catch him as he left his newspaper headquarters for home. It had always been a strong point with White to make his contemporaries understand that he had no special ambition to be a news-gatherer in the ordinary sense; but on this occasion he achieved a "scoop" which equalled in completeness the finest work of the elder Bennett in the same line, for his Emporia *Gazette* was the first newspaper in the country to publish full details of the affair derived from an authentic source. How circumstantial this account was may be judged from its statement that, as the assailant drew from her garments somewhere an "effective-looking whip, the editor of this paper sidestepped, and, what every true gentleman would do, ran forty yards like a Whitehead. . . . A footrace is one event in the sporting calendar in which any gent may vie his prowess with any lady. . . . Shooting the chutes, leaping the gap, or looping the loop, are clumsy, dilatory tactics compared with the way that fat old codger hiked the hike around to the back door of his office!"

If any one has cause to feel offended at William Allen White's freedom of expression in dealing with public men and events, it is the gentleman named William Allen White, who was talked of, a few years ago, as a possible Progressive candidate for Governor of Kansas. The *Gazette* came out at the time with a signed editorial article, denouncing as folly the notion of running such a man as White—"a four-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flusher, a ring-tailed, rip-snorting hell-raiser, and a grandstander," who "makes a big noise," and "yips and kioodles around a good deal, but is everlastingly and preëminently N. G. as gubernatorial timber, full of knots, warts, woodpecker holes and rotten spots"—with much more to the same purpose. Almost the only sustainable charge the *Gazette* failed to raise against the obnoxious upstart was that, in the early years of his married life, he used to bring his young family to his office every morning, his wife to help him with his newspaper work, and their baby to take its periodic naps on a bed of discarded manuscript in the waste-basket. The fact is, White has never seriously loomed as a politician ambitious for office, except once, about a dozen years ago, when Kansas was without a State Accountant because Gov. Bailey could not find a satisfactory man to appoint. White, in his desire to prove that the position was one of so obvious usefulness that any competent Kansan ought to be proud to fill it, was imprudent enough to say editorially that he would gladly accept it without a salary. The Governor promptly took him up, with the result that —well, White remained at his editorial desk to advise the Governor some more.

What need, pray, of official honors to augment the fame of the man who perhaps did more than any other one to seal the fate of Bryanism in the Presidential campaign of 1896, by explaining to the country exactly "What's the Matter with Kansas," and who performed a scarcely less excellent service in 1900 with a magazine article describing the Democratic candidate in a manner all the more surely fatal for its general friendliness of approach? TATTLER

# President Washington and the Senate

MR. WILSON'S appearance in the Senate on Monday of last week was said to be the first time that a President had in person addressed the Senate alone since George Washington. But Washington met with the Senate in secret. He set out in 1789 by regarding it as a sort of Privy Council. Our chief informant as to what passed between Washington and the Senate in executive session is William Maclay, a Senator from Pennsylvania. His "Journal," containing his record of what went on during the first two years of the first Senate, was not published until 1890.

Maclay's dislike of aristocrats and dread of the rise of a "court party" in the United States gave him a strong bias against President Washington. Thus his account of what passed when the latter made his first official visits to the Senate may be somewhat colored, though it is, no doubt, trustworthy in the facts set down. He answers, for example, a question which was raised in the House the other day. It was whether the President, when addressing the Senate or (by implication) the House, could be interrogated by a member. Speaker Clark ruled that he could not be in an open session, but might be in an executive session. Such was certainly the case when George Washington met with the Senate. The Father of his Country was heckled until he showed signs of exasperation.

In Maclay's "Journal" we find, under date of August 21, 1789, that there was considerable debate how the President should be received, where he should sit, etc. The Vice-President had previously expressed anxiety about what was to become of him when the President was there. He had asked the Senate for advice on that subject. "When the President comes into the Senate, what shall I be?" But he had to get what satisfaction he could out of the following opinion by Ellsworth: "I have looked over the Constitution, and I find, sir, it is evident and clear, sir, that wherever the Senate are to be, there, sir, you must be at the head of them. But further, sir [here he looked aghast, as if some tremendous gulf had yawned before him] I shall not pretend to say."

As a matter of fact, when George Washington entered the Senate chamber, he "took our Vice-President's chair." His Secretary of War, General Knox, "was seated on the left of the chair." Washington "rose and told us bluntly that he had called on us for our advice and consent to some propositions respecting the treaty with the Southern Indians." But the business did not go smoothly. There was objection to instant action. The Senate must inform itself. Maclay himself made a motion to call for the reading of all the papers. Thereupon, "I cast an eye at the President of the United States. I saw he wore an aspect of stern displeasure." The debate went on. The wheels of the legislative chariot drave heavily. Finally Maclay urged a postponement. His record is:

> I spoke through the whole in a low tone of voice. Peevishness itself, I think, could not have taken offence at anything I said. As I sat down, the President of the United States started up in a violent fret. "*This defeats every purpose of my coming here,*" were the first words that he said. He then went on that he had brought his Secretary of War with him to give every necessary information; that the Secretary knew all about the business, and yet he was delayed and could not go on with the matter.

There is a story which Mr. Taft, we believe, has accepted in his lecture upon the Presidency, that George Washington, on this occasion, quitted the Senate in a passion, declaring with profane emphasis that he would never go there again. But this, if true, must have been another time. Maclay, to be sure, had his fears: "I cannot now be mistaken. The President wishes to tread on the necks of the Senate." But on the following Monday, August 24, the "Journal" reads: "The President of the United States soon took his seat, and the business began. The President wore a different aspect from what he did Saturday. He was placid and serene, and manifested a spirit of accommodation." In fact, the matter was soon adjusted, "the President of the United States withdrew, and the Senate adjourned." The stern patriot Maclay set it down that the business went through so easily because "a shamefacedness, or I know not what, flowing from the presence of the President, kept everybody silent." Perhaps there were other reasons. Maclay had before noted bitterly that he had never been invited to dine with Washington. He was too rigid an anti-aristocrat. But on this fateful second day of Washington's going to the Senate, we find this amusing entry:

> Just as the Senate had fairly entered on business I was called out by the doorkeeper to speak to Col. Humphreys. It was to invite me to dinner with the President on Thursday next, at four o'clock. I really was surprised at the invitation. It will be my duty to go; however, I will make no inferences whatever. I am convinced all the dinner he can now give, or ever could, will make no difference in my conduct.

Honest Maclay! We are bound to say that the dinner did not make a royalist of him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# "And the Flood Was Forty Days Upon the Earth"

AT first we used to laugh at imagism. In those early days of the flood we jeered at the few critics who climbed aboard their Ark of safety: "It is only a passing shower," we sagely observed, "to-morrow the sky will be clear." And we were wont, before an open fire nicely ablaze, to circle our chairs and to give Charles, who read capitally, a copy of "Sword Blades and Poppy Seeds" and beg him to open to page twenty-five or to the one about

> I who am shut up with barren crockery
> In a dark closet

or to any other that had tickled our fancy. Then, while Charles turned the pages, the men with premonitory chuckles would settle themselves, and the ladies shake their heads at one another, half-doubtful, half-amused. How we enjoyed the new poetry then; how we laughed and made merry at the bold pronouncement,

> I am like to be very drunk to-night,

or at that sinister posset of stars:

> I will mix me a drink of stars,
> Large stars with polychrome needles,
> Small stars, jutting maroon and crimson,
> Cool, quiet, green stars:
> I will tear them out of the sky
> And squeeze them over an old silver cup;
> I will pour the cold scorn of my beloved into it,
> So that my drink shall be bubbled with ice.

Wild stuff we thought it, wild and vastly entertaining. It was like fire-engines clanging down the street or sheet-lightning in the sky: one involuntarily hurried to the window with an exclamation. But to return to our original figure of the flood; as the tide continued to rise, we fell into doubt. Would it, after all, stop to-morrow? Would the sky clear? Our best magazines caught the fever from our worst; our newspapers reprinted; our critics commented; our publishers published—the country was swept by free verse. It was no longer amusing; it irritated. Our scoffing changed to bitterness; our mouths were sour with disgust; and our hearts grew afraid that all our poetry was corrupt.

To-day the world is drowned with vers libre, for its waters have "prevailed exceedingly upon the earth"; and a few of us are glad to seize a line flung out from the wise men in the Ark. We have given up being amused; we have given up being bitter; we are now trying to be broad and judicial. Thus the new poetry has run the race of all novelties. As long as we laughed, it was assured of popularity; as long as we scorned bitterly, it was bound to grow in proportion to our fears; but now, as we accept it in the light of mere development, it is nigh unto death.

It has taken the world a good many years to learn that the new poetry is only a beneficial revulsion, only a vigorous purgative. Few cathartics are attractive to take or endure, but the shining eye which results justifies the medicine. Our poetry had grown abject, slavish, tired, jogtrot, copy-cat; we were vapid Tennysons, dull Wordsworths, meaningless Shelleys; the old bottles were filled with sour dregs and cobweb mustiness, unfit receptacles for new sparkling wine; we were intellectually dyspeptic. God prescribed Miss Lowell. To Calliope and Erato He recommended unsugared and nasty doses; and now, safe in the Ark, a few far-sighted critics are waiting till a new Ararat rears its crest above the muddy flood.

So our minds are at rest. We are able to look at Miss Lowell, not as Lord Jeffrey looked at Wordsworth's early work. Wordsworth wrote a great deal of very bad poetry; take, for example, "The Thorn":

> There is a Thorn—it looks so old,
> In truth, you'd find it hard to say
> How it could ever have been young,
> It looks so old and grey.
> Not higher than a two years' child
> It stands erect, this aged Thorn;
> No leaves it has, no prickly points;
> It is a mass of knotted joints,
> A wretched thing forlorn.
> It stands erect, and like a stone
> With lichens is it overgrown.

If this is just as bad, just as stupid, just as empty, just as unpoetical as anything may well be, we excuse it because without it the world of hearts and souls might never have been quickened by such a line as

> The still, sad music of humanity.

What matter if Wordsworth wrote:

> She pats the Pony, where or when
> She knows not, happy Betty Foy!
> The little Pony glad may be,
> But he is milder far than she,
> You hardly can perceive his joy,

so long as he could also write:

> Perhaps the plaintive numbers flow
> For old, unhappy, far-off things,
> And battles long ago.

Miss Lowell and the other extremists are doing to our world a great service, similar to that for which a century ago Wordsworth was reviled and persecuted. She is neither poisonous nor inane; she is medicinal.

> I want to be a carpenter,
> To work all day long in clean wood,
> Shaving it into little thin slivers
> Which screw up into curls behind my plane. . . .

This is Miss Lowell's latest wish. She also wants "to shingle a house, sitting on a ridgepole, in a bright breeze"—a picture which in those happier days Charles would have gurgled over, as no doubt an early nineteenth-century Charles gurgled over Wordsworth's

> Forth to the gentle Ass he springs,
> And up about his neck he climbs;
> In loving words he talks to him,
> He kisses, kisses face and limb,
> He kisses him a thousand times!

It matters not whether that grotesque, ungovernable fancy of Miss Lowell's ever takes lofty wing. She has done the world imperishable service; she has cleaned out our old bottles and left them pure, sweet, and welcoming for new wine. To place her in juxtaposition to Wordsworth (and one can see the gray, old man shrivel in such company) is not to intimate that she may some day write immortal lines. About poets one must not prophesy. It is enough that she has ministered to a mind diseased; another may do the rest.

The new poetry has done its work, done it well, and the world is sickening of the medicine. To-day the imagists are advertising their wares too patently; they are all going about stark naked simply because one or two have in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ecstasy ripped off their clothes. As Professor Firkins says of Kreymborg's book: it has "at worst the half-decorous interest which we feel in a crowd of people whom a fire alarm has driven into the midnight street in their night gear, but in this case a certain coquetry in the pajamas awakens the suspicion that the alarm was preconcerted." In other words, Miss Lowell and the other beginners had something to say and said it, while the imagist to-day has nothing to say—and says it. The flood, to revert to our original figure, has reached its maximum; "the fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven are stopped"; it will soon be time to send forth the dove.

ROBERT CUTLER

# The American School of Classical Studies at Athens

TRAM 15 takes the American visitor as far as the Athens Normal School for Teachers, at the end of the street of the Patriarch Joachim. Climbing the unpaved road leading up the Lycabettus Hill, and taking the first corner on your right by the high wall enclosing the gardens of the Normal School, you come, after a two-minute walk along the dusty road, to the gates of the American School, just beyond the tower of the British School, adjoining. The name ΑΜΕΡΙΚΑΝΙΚΗ ΣΧΟΛΗ is carved in Greek letters on the stone pillar on one side of the high green gates of iron open-work, and in English on the other.

The road to the School lies on the southeastern slope of the hill, which is an extension of the ridge from which rises the Rock of Lycabettus. The slope starts up from the white, dusty road, a picture of barrenness in the summer heat, the scant herbiage hardly differing in color from the bare, baked earth that it but thinly covers in irregular patches. To the left, pushed out on the hill, are a few small, one-story houses, tinted yellow and pink. In front of them stand some Australian eucalyptus trees, and seen above the tiled roofs a plantation of young pines on the hill gives a relieving note of green. Then there rises suddenly the blazing Rock of Lycabettus, throwing back so strongly the heat and light of the August sun as to appear itself alight and burning in gray and red metallic heat, with the little white Chapel of St. George at the top against the deep blue, vaporous sky. All the harshness is in the near landscape—the sky itself of dreamy beauty.

As you enter the gates of the School branches of scarlet oleander show themselves above the walls, and you pass under a great Judas tree, whose wealth of purple flowers is a springtime glory. Myrtles, laurels, and other native plants grow in the garden, and tall shrubs, with white and blood-red flowers. The broad carriage-way leads to the square portico of the main entrance. Coming from the heat and light outside, one receives an impression of solidity, coolness, and cleanliness in the marble entrance and stairway of the same material that takes you to the wide landing of polished hardwood on the first floor, from which open the director's study, the reception-room, and the large library.

It was at the annual meeting of Archæological Institute of America in 1881 that a committee was appointed to devise a plan for the creation in Athens of an American School of Classical Literature, Art, and Antiquities. The committee issued a circular asking aid from those American colleges which ultimately became its chief supporters. The response met with brought the School into being, and the following year work began in Athens in hired rooms, with Prof. W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard, as director of the first year's work of the School. It was only six years later that the School took possession of the permanent home it now occupies.

The land on which the commodious house of the School now stands is about an acre and a half in extent, and immediately adjoins the grounds of the British School. It was given by the Greek Government in 1886, its estimated value at that time being about $13,000. Its value must have more than doubled by now. Plans were prepared by Professor Ware, of the Columbia School of Architecture, and Mr. Trowbridge, the New York architect (at that time one of his students), spent nearly two years in Greece supervising the erection of the building. The iron stairway in one section, the fine hardwood floors and mantelpieces—in fact, all the woodwork and hardware used in the house—were the gifts of American firms. This reduced the original cost of the house to $30,000. The additions and thorough repairs carried out in 1913-15 by Mr. Dinsmoor, of Boston, the resident architect, and Mr. Thompson, of New York, cost as much more—actually somewhat over $30,000.

One of the most American features of the house is the three bathrooms, of the best American design and construction, American workmen and plumbers having come to Athens to carry out the work. The Queen of Greece recently visited the School, and repeated the visit the same week, accompanied by the King, pointing out to him the bathrooms, that were her special admiration. And both King and Queen admitted that the palace and royal summer home had no such faultless installations.

There is a pleasant sense of being at home in the United States in the large, airy library, with its American hardwood, polished floor and American furniture of good, simple design. Only a look through the window at the Attic landscape without dispels the illusion. The shelves are filled with the standard works in English and foreign languages on the art—in its most comprehensive sense—literature, and history of ancient Greece. There the student can at once lay his hand on any book dealing with the special study he has taken up, and when tired of reading he can step out on the white marble balcony at the end of the library and rest his eyes on the great Hill of Hymettus. The very bareness and barrenness of the mountain becomes a thing of beauty in the vaporous atmosphere—cool and warm grays, pinks, faint greens, and neutral tints, with purple flying shadows from the clouds above, and the brown slopes of the smaller hills at the base. And in the immediate foreground is the irregular group of low, tile-roofed buildings of the somnolent old Monastery of St. Michael, its red and yellow striped Byzantine chapel almost concealed by the clean-stemmed pines, branching out like green candelabra at the top, and the slender, compact, pointed cypresses rising above. The great-leaved fig trees and olive trees extending to the highway relieve the bareness of the walled garden of the monastery. A barefoot boy, with long bamboo cane, comes down the road. The rich, ripe fruit of the fig trees seen beyond the wall is too much for his scruples, and he deftly spears the heavy yellow and purple fruit and fills his canvas pockets.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Prof. Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale, wrote, in 1902, the first concise sketch of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and gave some account of the first twenty years of its work, he could already point out the influence exercised by the School on the higher branches of education in the United States. The excavations carried out in that time alone had more than justified the existence of the School and the expense incurred. They had added to the world's sum of archæological knowledge, and given to the School a prestige which has yearly increased. The first excavations at Thorikos, Sikyon, and Eretria gave direct evidence in the ancient theatres unearthed, which led to a fuller understanding of the externals of the Greek drama. The important excavations of the Argive Heræum were followed by the authoritative work of Charles Waldstein—a one-time student of Columbia—done in collaboration with ten other members of the School.

In the present year, 1916, the excavations begun in 1896 at Corinth are being carried on with untiring earnestness by Mr. Blegen and the director of the School, B. H. Hill, and are of extreme interest, the present depths unearthed yielding houses and objects of the Mycenæan period, and thus removing doubts of the existence of work of that age on the site of ancient Corinth.

In Athens itself the two buildings that have been thoroughly studied by the American School in the last ten years are the Erechtheum and the Propylæa, on which special folios are in preparation. The work already mentioned, together with the work and researches of Mr. Hill on the older Parthenon, burnt by the Persians, on whose site the present Parthenon stands, and that of Mr. Dinsmoor, the resident architect, on the Delphic treasuries, place the work of the American School on the high level of the best work of the French, English, German, and Austrian schools. There is also the work of Miss Walker, of Vassar, and Miss Goldman, of Bryn Mawr and Radcliffe, who, raising independent funds, carried on at intervals from 1911 excavations during three years on the site of the ancient town of Halæ. And there was the notable work of Miss Boyd (Mrs. Hawes), the pioneer woman excavator in Crete, and that of Miss Edith H. Hall (Mrs. Dohan), of the Pennsylvania University Museum, both members of the School, who, with the percentage of finds allowed by the then Cretan Government, greatly enriched the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania.

Prof. T. D. Seymour, of Yale, who was chairman of the managing committee of the School from 1887 to 1902, said: "The scholar who is to teach Greek literature and history should have the clearest views of what formed the foundation and background for this history and literature, and this clearest view may be obtained best by the sight of his own eyes. In other words, a Greek scholar will be a better teacher of Greek literature, as well as of history, if he has visited Greece." And he added: "The School does not aim solely nor perhaps mainly at training specialists in archæology; it devises also and perhaps chiefly to encourage on the part of classical scholars archæological study which will throw light upon their classical studies and will give life to their teaching and interpretation of literature."

Two hundred and fourteen students, graduates of American colleges, have already benefited by a stay in the School. This year, owing to the war, the School is empty, only one student (Mr. Scott, of Princeton) being present. The term is from October 1 to June 1. Two months are spent in travel in the autumn with an officer of the School. Then follow the pursuit of the various special studies and the attendance on the School lectures and those of the French, German, Austrian, and English schools. Being on the roll of the American School confers this privilege, and vice-versa. International good will and brotherhood in emulation are expressed in the work of the schools in Athens. But the great war makes itself felt. The foreign schools are empty, the young men absent fulfilling their military duties.

The American students may as a rule come less well prepared than the men of the French School, but they "make good" by their initiative and originality, bringing with them the new breath and clear vision of the young Western world. Mr. E. B. Andrews, of Cornell, in 1896 recovered from the nail-holes of the lost bronze letters on the east architrave of the Parthenon the inscription in honor of Nero. Mr. H. F. de Cou, of Michigan, in 1892, made the surprising discovery that all the well-known textbooks and the later writers on the interesting reliefs of the monument of Lysicrates had based their estimate of this work on inaccurate representations of the sequence of figures in the relief, all having copied their illustrations from the original publication of Stuart and Revett, in which two of the drawings had been misplaced.

Among many other instances, the exploits might be cited of Mr. W. S. Ebersole, of Iowa, who by the use of rope ladders made a more careful study than had before been made of the west metopes of the Parthenon, and of Mr. C. N. Brown, of Harvard, who had himself suspended outside the wall of the Acropolis, and so read various ancient inscriptions that had been built into the wall, and that could not be read from below. Professor Dörpfeld, the leading German archæologist, in a general review on recent progress in the study of Athenian buildings, stated that the newest and most original interpretations were the work of the American School.

The present endowment of the American School is about $80,000. It should be at least $200,000, and there should be a special endowment for excavations. The largest private donor to the excavation fund at Corinth is Mrs. J. M. Sears, of Boston, in memory of her son, J. M. Sears, who was a student of the School. There is an opportunity now, if the funds were forthcoming, for the purchase of some land across the street as a site for the residence of women members of the School. This, with the building and the endowment to maintain it, should be added to the School's equipment.

The French Government considers the proper maintenance of the French School in Athens as one of the obligations of good government. The American Government leaves such work to the enterprise of its colleges and the practical devotion to ideals of private individuals among its citizens. *Τρέφεται δέ, ὦ Σώκρατες, ψυχὴ τίνι; Μαθήμασι δήπου, ἦν δ'ἐγώ.* (And what, Socrates, is the food of the soul? Surely, I said, knowledge.)

JOHN A. HUYBERS

*Athens, August 21, 1916**

*Owing to the pressure of foreign correspondence relating to the war, the publication of Mr. Huybers's letter on the American School at Athens has been of necessity delayed.—Ed. THE NATION.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Finance

## The High Mark in Trade

IN its general outlines, the Government's statement of the country's foreign trade, in December and in the whole of 1916, was merely in line with expectations. That last month's merchandise exports of $521,000,000 should have run $3,100,000 beyond the highest previous monthly record and $161,000,000 above even December, 1915, and that exports and imports combined should have broken the record by $31,000,000, merely marked another notch in the rising of trade expansion towards its climax. Exchange of bank checks in the United States, the measure of internal business activity, made similar comparisons in December. The total drawn and collected last month exceeded by $488,000,000, or nearly 2 per cent., the largest monthly record of this year; it rose 33 per cent. above December, 1915, and not quite 60 per cent. above the highest before the war.

It is the results of the full year 1916, however, which attract the larger interest at this time. Briefly, the fact is that our merchandise export trade last year ran $1,939,000,000 beyond 1915, although the total export trade never until 1911 reached the figure of $1,900,000,000, and that last year's excess of merchandise exports over imports not only rose $1,310,000,000 above 1915, but was nearly ten times as great as in 1914, and four-and-a-half times as large as the highest annual "export excess" before this war. During the past two years, our export surplus has been $4,867,000,000; it was never more than $1,273,000,000 in any two consecutive years of our earlier history. Here is the interesting offset, and largely the explanation for the $2,000,000,000 of our own securities brought back from Europe since 1914 and for the $1,700,000,000 new foreign securities taken in the two-year period by our own investors.

On its face, this would seem to indicate that conditions underlying our export trade have progressed uniformly during 1915 and 1916. But, as a matter of fact, the composition of our export trade in the two years was radically different. The value of our agricultural exports did, to be sure, increase $141,000,000 during 1916 (almost wholly because of the much higher prices); but whereas they made up 70 per cent. of the total exports during 1915, their proportion during 1916 was less than 33 per cent. On the other hand, even without allowing for December, whose detailed returns are not yet all at hand, last year's exports of fully or partly manufactured goods rose $1,650,000,000 over 1915—of which increase, $793,000,000 was in war material alone, and $400,000,000 steel and iron, largely to use in foreign manufacture of munitions of war.

As yet there has been no evidence in the monthly foreign trade returns of that decrease in "war orders" which has for several months been somewhat vaguely predicted. This does not prove that the predictions were wrong, however. It was fully six months after the first large "war orders" were placed before the exports began to cut a large figure in our exports statements, and the same thing would happen, in the opposite direction, supposing a slackening of new orders. Quite beyond this consideration, however, such returns of foreign trade as those for 1916 lend curious conjecture to the question, what kind of comparison will the statements be making a year or two years hence?

# BOOKS OF THE WEEK

### FICTION

Joyce, J. A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Huebsch. $1.50 net.
Webster, H. K. The Thoroughbred. Bobbs-Merrill. $1.35 net.
Weston, G. Oh Mary Be Careful! Lippincott. $1 net.

### MISCELLANEOUS

A List of American Doctoral Dissertations Printed in 1915. Prepared by A. M. Stephens. Washington Government Printing Office.
Bissett, C. P. Abraham Lincoln. An Address. Los Angeles, Cal.: Cannell Smith Chaffin Co.
Dane, C. Regiment of Women. Macmillan. $1.50 net.
Ewers, H. H. Edgar Allan Poe. Translated from the German by A. Lewisohn. Huebsch. 60 cents net.
Gulliver, J. H. Studies in Democracy. Putnam. $1 net.
Hall, B. Thrift. Huebsch. $1.
Henry Ford's Own Story. As Told to Rose Wilder Land. New York: Ellis O. Jones. $1 net.
Muspratt, E. K. My Life and Work. Lane. $2.50 net.
Oswald, J. C. Benjamin Franklin, Printer. Doubleday, Page. $2 net.
Rodd, R. Love, Worship and Death. Longmans, Green. $1 net.
Russell, B. Why Men Fight. Century. $1.50 net.
Sainsbury, E. B. A Calender of the Court Minutes, etc., of the East India Company, 1655-1659. Introd. by W. Foster. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d. net.
Tatlock, J. M. Greek and Roman Mythology. Century. $1.50.
The New Republic Book. Selections from the First Hundred Issues. Republic Publishing Co.
Tout, T. F. A Mediæval Burglary. A Lecture. Longmans, Green. 40 cents net.
Tout, T. F. The English Civil Service in the Fourteenth Century. A Lecture. Longmans, Green. 40 cents net.
Wright, G. F. Story of My Life and Work. Oberlin, O.: Bibliotheca Sacra Co. $2.
Yeats, W. B. The Tables of the Law and The Adoration of the Magi. Macmillan. $1.25.

### RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

Brown, R. E., and Perdriau, L. H. Christian Certainties. Boston: Pilgrim Press. 65 cents net.
Frank, H. Psychic Phenomena, Science and Immortality. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Boston: Sherman, French. $2.50 net.
Harris, W. S. Christian Science and the Ordinary Man. Putnam. $1.50 net.
Lodge, O. Raymond or Life and Death. Doran. $3 net.
Semple, H. C. Heaven Open to Souls. Benziger Brothers. $2 net.
Ward, A. S. The Ministry of Jesus. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. $1 net.

### BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Bassett, J. S. The Middle Group of American Historians. Macmillan. $2 net.
Dellenbaugh, F. S. Custer (True Stories of Great Americans). Macmillan. 50 cents.
Hodgkin, T. Italy and Her Invaders. Vols. V and VI. Second edition. Oxford University Press. 36s. net.
Joyce, J. Dubliners. Huebsch. $1.50 net.
Robinson, C. E. The Days of Alkibiades. Longmans, Green. $1.50 net.
Wilson, C. R. Chapters from My Official Life. Longmans, Green.

### TRAVEL

Steele, D. M. Going Abroad Overland. Putnam. $1.50 net.

### POETRY

Aiken, C. The Jig of Forslin. Boston: The Four Seas Co. $1.25 net.
Baird, G. M. P. Rune and Rann. Pittsburgh, Pa.: The Aldine Press.
Braithwaite, W. S. The Anthology of Magazine Verse, 1916. Laurence J. Gomme. $1.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coates, F. E. Poems. Vols. I and II. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50 net the set.
Gibson, W. W. Livelihood. Macmillan. $1.25 net.
Morgan, E., and Knish, A. Spectra. New Poems. Mitchell Kennerley.
Watson, W. Retrogression and Other Poems. Lane. $1.25 net.

SCIENCE

Hillebrand, W. F. Our Analytical Chemistry and Its Future. Columbia University Press. 25 cents net.
McLennan, E. Cosmical Evolution. Second edition. Privately printed.

DRAMA AND MUSIC

Watts, M. S. Three Short Plays. Macmillan. $1.25 net.

ART

Arts and Crafts. A Review of the Work Executed by Students in the Leading Art Schools of Great Britain and Ireland. Lane. $2.50.
Borenius, T. Pictures by the Old Masters in the Library of Christ Church, Oxford. Oxford University Press. $1.75.
Piddington, A. B. Spanish Sketches. Oxford University Press. $2.
The Art of George Frederick Munn. Edited by M. C. Munn and M. R. Cabot. Dutton. $2.25.

TEXTBOOKS

An den Ufern des Rheins. Edited by P. S. Allen. Holt.
Freytag, G. Die Journalisten. Edited by W. D. Toy. Heath. 45 cents.
Mendell, C. W. Latin Sentence Connection. Yale University Press. $1.50 net.
Miller, E. L. Practical English Composition, Book IV. Houghton Mifflin. 45 cents net.
Prokosch, E. The Sounds and History of the German Language. Holt.
Rankin, T. E., and Aikin, W. M. English Literature. Macmillan. $1.20.
Snedden, D. Problems of Secondary Education. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50 net.
Supple, E. W. Spanish Reader of South American History. Macmillan. $1 net.
The New Barnes Readers: Book One, and Primer. A. S. Barnes Co.


**Makers of the 19th Century**

Octavo, each, $2.00 net.

*Again in stock*

**Lord Charnwood's**
**ABRAHAM LINCOLN**

*Just Ready*

**Hugh Elliot's**
**HERBERT SPENCER**

**David Hannay's**
**PORFIRIO DIAZ**

*Previously Issued*

**Sir Edward Cook's**
**DELANE OF THE TIMES**

Henry Holt & Co. 34 W. 33d St. New York

**Ordeal by Fire**
**Marcel Berger**

Author of "The Crime of Rue Rodier," "L'Homme Enchaine," etc.

12°. $1.50 net.

"One of the first soaring Latin masterpieces to which the war was bound to give birth." The author was an actor in the frightful strife on the Marne and gives a faithful and inspiring account of the glorious accomplishments of his hero and the girl who remained true.

*All Booksellers*

**G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS**
**New York** **London**

***David Lawrence***

***is the***

***Man who called the Turn on the election prophesying on Saturday, November 4th***

a victory for Wilson without New York, New Jersey, Illinois and Indiana, but with California, Washington, Montana, etc., after a transcontinental tour of observation. His dispatches from Washington, D. C., appear daily in

**The New York Evening Post**

¶ These dispatches are analytical, unbiassed, and informative. They interpret the news and tell you what you most want to know about the big moves in Washington in domestic and foreign policy.

¶ Ten Dollars a year to keep informed on Washington, to get also the *best financial* news in America, the best *book reviews*, the most independent of *editorials*, the fairest comment on *college sports*, *cartoons* that are artistic, and a *Saturday supplement* with contributions of first rank in American literature.

*More Than a Newspaper—A National Institution*


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Summary of the News

COMMENT from abroad on President Wilson's speech before the Senate has been restrained and, on the whole, not unfavorable. Everywhere due tribute is paid to the idealism of the President's utterance, but the stone against which Allied feet strike is the phrase "peace without victory." Unreserved endorsement comes from two daily papers of standing in England, the London *Daily News* and the *Manchester Guardian;* the weekly *Nation* also hails President Wilson as a "deliverer"; the rest, even of the Liberal papers, fall foul of "peace without victory" and the "freedom of the seas." Official opinion was expressed in a speech by Bonar Law on January 24. Declaring that the President's aims were essentially those of the Entente Allies, Mr. Law went on to say that those aims could only be achieved by an Allied victory, since neutrals had been unable to stop German violations of international law and Hague conventions.

FRENCH comment differs little from English, except perhaps in being a trifle more suave in criticism. A resolution was, however, adopted on January 26 by the eighty-nine United Socialist Deputies in the Chamber urging the Government to affirm its accord with the principles expressed in President Wilson's address and to "prepare and hasten an early and just ending of the present war." The more conservative press of Paris severely criticises this resolution, Gustave Hervé describing it as a capitulation to the minority of the Socialist party designed to prevent a rupture of the *union sacrée.*

RUSSIA has undoubtedly contributed the most effective comment in the official statement issued by the Foreign Office on January 26, in which unreserved endorsement is given to Mr. Wilson's message. Limitation of armaments, free access to the seas, and the freedom of Poland, "consisting now of three separated provinces," are all objects which Russia can give cordial support. While as for "peace without victory," it is pointed out that it has never been the aim of the Allies to crush their enemies and "they have never insisted upon victory in that sense."

IN Germany a wide divergence of views is expressed, the general tone of the comment being on the whole less favorable than in the Allied countries. Nevertheless, if Count Reventlow loses no time in coming forward with his usual tirade against America and all things American, we find Maximilian Harden following up his former appreciative views of President Wilson with an article deploring current suspicions of America in Germany and paying high tribute to the message. Officially there has been no expression of opinion. The Kaiser celebrated his birthday by speaking of the "unshakable will to victory of the German people," but that was only to say the expected. If there was an indirect reference in his speech acknowledging the toast of the Emperor Charles of Austria, it was probably not to President Wilson's address, but to the comment on it elicited from Count Tisza, the Hungarian Premier, by a question put to him in Parliament on January 25, in which he hinted that further negotiations with the United States might take place.

THAT discussion of the President's proceeding should have been more acrimonious in this country than elsewhere is perhaps not surprising. Considerations of courtesy, imposed on foreign countries in discussing the actions of the ruler of a friendly nation, do not apply to domestic criticism. Hence some plain speaking in press and Senate and the desire for opportunity of still plainer speaking embodied in Senator Borah's resolution, offered on January 25, but still held up by Democratic opposition as we write, calling for a full-dress debate on the Monroe Doctrine and the traditional policy of non-interference in the affairs of Europe. On the other hand, the President's action has met with cordial treatment at the hands of such political opponents as Mr. Root and ex-President Taft.

LABOR in England expressed its attitude on questions of war and peace in various resolutions adopted at last week's meeting of the Labor Conference at Manchester. The new Ministry of Lloyd George and the action of three labor leaders in accepting office in it were endorsed by a vote of six to one. A resolution favoring the immediate offer of peace proposals was rejected by a vote of three to one, but proposals for the formation of an international league to enforce peace after the war and for "free trade for every country" were adopted unanimously.

MILITARY operations on nearly all the fronts have apparently been hampered by the intense cold which has been widespread in Europe during the past week. Nevertheless considerable activity has been manifested, the Allies on the whole having the better of the exchanges. Strong German attacks were launched on January 25 at Verdun, between Avocourt Wood and Dead Man's Hill, and were successful in occupying a considerable portion of advanced trenches. French counter-attacks seem, however, to have re-won most of the ground lost. On the Somme the British report successful trench raids. On the Moldavian portion of the Rumanian front recent news indicates that the Russians and the re-formed Rumanian army now hold their line strongly and are even in a position to take the initiative. Russian success over a front of two miles on the northwestern frontier of Moldavia was reported on January 28 and was admitted by Berlin. In the Riga district is a see-saw of battle. The Russians were pushed back with considerable losses early last week from positions they had recently gained, but by the end of the week their line seemed to be firmly established and German attacks were repulsed. Dispatches from Paris on Sunday revealed the fact that the Salonica force is operating in the neighborhood of Prilep, twenty-five miles north of Monastir, which would seem to indicate that General Sarrail has pushed forward a considerable distance. Reports of British operations in Mesopotamia and in German East Africa indicate progress in the offensives.

A DESTROYER engagement took place off Zeebrugge on the night of January 23 in the course of which, according to the report of the British Admiralty, one British and one German destroyer were sunk. The German report declares that the only vessel missing is a destroyer which was towed in a sinking condition into the Dutch port of Ymuiden. The coast of Suffolk was shelled, with insignificant damage, by an adventurous German craft on the night of January 25. Announcement of the sinking by mine or submarine of the British auxiliary cruiser Laurentic, with considerable loss of life, was made on Sunday.

NAVAL measures of increased rigor seem to be foreshadowed by the statement of the British Admiralty on January 27 declaring an enlarged area of the North Sea dangerous to shipping on account of belligerent operations. The statement means the laying of a new mine field starting from off Flamborough Head and spreading towards Jutland, on the Danish coast, and Terschelling Island, on the Dutch coast. Dispatches from London also tell of energetic action by the new Department of Shipping in replacing tonnage sunk by submarines and foretell the arming fore and aft of all merchant vessels.

THE Immigration bill was vetoed by President Wilson on Monday.

DEFINITE announcement of the recall of the United States troops from Mexico was made by Secretary Baker on Sunday. The movement is already under way.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S programme for the prevention of railway strikes was again rejected by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate on January 24 by a vote of ten to five.

THE Emergency Revenue bill, providing for the raising of $200,000,000 by direct taxation, $100,000,000 in bonds, in addition to the Panama Canal bonds already authorized, and an increase in the permissible limit for the issuance of short-time certificates from $200,000,000 to $300,000,000, was reported to the House on Monday.

SHELLS for the navy will not, after all, be made by the English firm of Hadfields, the British Government, it was announced on January 24, having refused permission to take up the contract "so long as the exigencies of war continue."

THE "leak" inquiry continues to drag its slow length along. Investigation by the Committee's counsel, Sherman L. Whipple, last week established the fact, already well known, that from Secretary Lansing's hint to the newspaper men all Wall Street was aware that something was going to happen three hours before the President's note was given out. The Committee resumed its sessions in New York on Monday, when Mr. Fisk directly contradicted testimony given by Mr. Lawson pretending to implicate Secretary McAdoo.

JAPAN is in the throes of a constitutional crisis, which was brought to a head on January 25, when Parliament was dissolved by Imperial rescript. Strong opposition to Premier Terauchi, on the ground that his appointment violated the spirit of the Constitution, developed at the opening of the Diet on Tuesday of last week; there followed an attempt at a political meeting to assassinate Yukio Ozaki, leader of the Constitutional party and formerly Minister of Justice, and when it became obvious that a vote of lack of confidence would be passed the Government took the drastic step of dissolving Parliament. New elections will probably be held in April or May.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED